

THE
CLASSICAL JOURNAL,

FOR

MARCH AND JUNE. 1822.

VOL. XXV

“Ω φίλος, εἰ σοφὸς εἶ, λάβε μ' ἐς χέρας· εἰ δέ γε πᾶμπαν
Νῆϊς ἔφους Μουσέων, ῥίψον ἅ μὲν νοέεις.

EPICR. I. 241.



London:

PRINTED BY A. J. VALPY,
RED LION COURT, FLEET STREET.

SOLD BY
LONGMAN, HURST, REES, ORME, AND BROWN; F. C. AND
J. RIVINGTONS; SHERWOOD AND CO., PATERNOSTER
ROW; PARKER, OXFORD; BARRET, CAM-
BRIDGE; MACREDIE AND CO., EDIN-
BURGH; CUMMING, DUBLIN; AND
ALL OTHER BOOKSELLERS.

1822.

ERRATA

IN NO. XLVII.

P. 107 l. 23. of notes, 2 Col. *for hard read* hand.
117. 34. 1 Col. *read injeccrimus.*

The Numbers are always regularly published on the first of April, July, October, and January. Subscribers may, therefore, have them with their Reviews and Magazines, by giving a general order to their Booksellers.

*The former Numbers may now be had of all the Booksellers.
Price 8s. each.*

Articles are requested to be sent one month at least before the day of publication, directed to Mr. A. J. Valpy, Red Lion Court, Fleet Street, London.

CONTENTS OF NO., XLIX.

	PAGE
Notice of a Classical and Topographical Tour through Greece; by EDW. DODWELL	1
Nugæ, No. II.	9
Puerilia, No. III.	11
Cambridge Triposes for 1822.— <i>Medora Conrado</i> .— <i>Fons Egeria</i>	14
On the Fables of Æsop and Babrias	20
Arithmetic of the Holy Scriptures	29
An Inquiry into the Symbolical Language of Ancient Art and Mythology. By R. P. KNIGHT	33
On the Origin, Progress, Prevalence, and Decline of Idolatry. By the Rev. G. TOWNSEND	51
Memoir on the Antiquity of the Zodiacs of Esneh and Dendera. Part III.	63
Notice of J. H. BOTHE'S Edition of <i>L. Annæi Seneca Tragædia, &c.</i>	81
Latin Poem:— <i>Vectis Insula pulcherrima</i>	84
Criticisms on some passages of Hakluyt's <i>Collection of the early Voyages, Travels, and Discoveries of the English Nation</i>	89
Notice of <i>The Life of William Sancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury</i> , by G. D'OYLY, D. D. F. R. S. Part II.	95
On the Life and Writings of Casimir	103
Epigrammata, Epitaphia, Variorum	110
Languages in which the translation and distribution of the	

	PAGE.
Scriptures have been promoted by the British and Foreign Bible Society	113
Concise View of the Translations of the Holy Scriptures	116
Carmen Seculare. Anno 1801 ineunte. By R. P. JOHNSON	120
Γραφικὴ Ἐταιρία of Corfu	128
Observations on Professors COUSIN'S and CREUZER'S Commentaries of Proclus	134
Account of Baron NIEHBUR'S Discoveries in the Vatican at Rome	142
Critical Observations on the Appendixes to Burckhardt's Travels in Nubia	148
Latin Epistle to the late Professor PORSON	157
Franciscus Portus and his Æschylus. By G. BURGESS	150
Notice of D. FRENCH'S <i>Munusculum Juventutis, seu Phædri Fabulæ versibus Hexametris concinnatæ</i>	164
Prologue and Epilogue to the Andria of Terence, performed at Westminster School, 1821	166-7
On the true Age of Christ at the Crucifixion	169
Notice of G. BURGESS'S <i>Æschyli Tragædiæ: Supplices et Eumenides</i>	182
Bibliography	188
Greek Inscriptions	192
Literary Intelligence	193
Notes to Correspondents	198

CONTENTS OF NO. L.

	PAGE.
Classical Biography. No. I.— <i>Life of Bulcaus</i>	201
Professor DUNBAR's Defence of his <i>Analecta Græca</i> <i>Majora</i>	209
Observations on some ORATIONS ascribed to CICERO. No. V.	221
Corrections in the common Translation of the New Testa- ment. No. VI.	225
Notice of Professor BOISSONADE's <i>Excerpta ex Procli</i> <i>Scholis in Cratylum Platonis</i>	229
An Inquiry into the Symbolical Language of Ancient Art and Mythology. Part VI. By R. P. KNIGHT	241
Epistola Macaronica. By Dr. GEDDES	259
On the Origin, Progress, Prevalence, and Decline, of Idolatry. Part VIII. By the Rev. G. TOWNSEND	268
Proposal for a Latin Colony	281
Memoir on the Antiquity of the Zodiacs of Esneh and Dendera. Part IV.	284
Observations on Professors COUSIN'S and CREÜZER'S <i>Commentaries of Proclus</i> . No. II.	300
Dublin Prize Essay:— <i>On the Analogy of Poetry and</i> <i>Painting</i>	306
EUBULUS on the Present System of Academic Education in the University of Cambridge	327

	PAGE.
E. H. BARKER's Reply to <i>ΒΟΛΗΤΟΣ</i>	337
Marklandi Notæ MSS. in Euripidem	339
Critical Remarks on Dr. OSANN's Edition of <i>Philemon</i>	343
Notice of <i>The Lyrics of Horace; being the First Four Books of his Odes.</i> Translated by the Rev. F. WRANGHAM	346
Diogenes Laertius, a Patre an a Patria sic vocatus sit? By E. H. BARKER	348
Nugæ, No. III.	349
Notice of <i>Illustrations of Hogarth; i. e. Hogarth illustrated from passages in Authors he never read, and could not understand</i>	354
Nugæ Criticæ	357
Observations on some of the Notes in the late Mr. DAZEL's <i>Collectanea Græca Majora.</i> By the Rev. J. SEAGER	358
On the Fables of Æsop and Babrias. No. II.	364
Oriental Literature	371
ADVERSARIA LITERARIA, No. XXIX.—Epigrammata, Epitaphia, Variorum.—Latin Letter by the celebrated Earl of Essex.—Coriolanus.—Classical Criticism.—Egyptian mode of embalming bodies	373
Oxford English Prize Poem, for 1822:— <i>Palmyra</i>	379
Postscript to the Memoir on the Antiquity of the Zodiacs of Esneh and Dendera	380
Literary Intelligence	381
Notes to Correspondents	386

THE
CLASSICAL JOURNAL.

Nº. XLIX.

MARCH, 1822.



NOTICE OF

A Classical and Topographical Tour through Greece,
by EDWARD DODWELL, ESQ., F. S. A., &c.

WHEN we inform our readers that this work occupies two large quarto volumes, (containing altogether above eleven hundred pages, rather closely printed,) and that those volumes are replete with interesting, curious, and instructive matter; they will easily perceive that a much greater space than the miscellaneous nature of our Journal allows to reviews of new publications would not by any means suffice even for a slight notice of all the passages that seem to us worthy of their attention. We shall not, therefore, undertake to offer more than an outline of Mr. Dodwell's Tour, premising (what can rarely be said of modern travellers) that he appears throughout this work more studious of compression than of amplification, though evidently writing from an abundant mass of materials, and always perfectly master of his subject.

Without further prelude we shall state, that Mr. Dodwell began the journey of which he gives an account, at Venice, in April, 1801, and concluded it at Rome, in September, 1806; but the publication of his work was prevented for several years by his detention on the Continent, under Bonaparte's government. He acknowledges, however, various obligations to many worthy and accomplished Frenchmen, who facilitated his literary researches, and contributed to soften the distressing circumstances attendant on captivity. He had also the good fortune to enjoy, during some part of his travels, the society of Mr. (now Sir William) Gell, and Mr. Atkins. From Venice our author proceeded in a merchant vessel trading with the Ionian Islands,

VOL. XXV. CL. XL. NO. XLIX. A

and landed at Cattaro, an episcopal see, supposed to be the ancient *ΑΣΚΡΟΤΙΟΝ*, the Ascrivium of the Romans. (Vol. i. p. 17.) Here, he remarks, the people are extremely superstitious,—“If a female has convulsions, they imagine she is possessed by the Devil, who is supposed not to attack men; they have frequently burnt their unfortunate women alive, thinking it the more efficacious method of destroying the evil spirit. So late as the year 1799, the Austrian Governor, with great difficulty, prevented the inhabitants of Castel-nuovo from burning a girl of nineteen, who happened to be subject to convulsions.” From Cattaro Mr. D. sailed to Corfu, then under the protection of a Russian and a Turkish fleet:—he had not been there two hours before a quarrel occurred in the market-place, between the Greeks and some Turkish sailors, who, always armed and always insolent, paraded the streets in a most overbearing manner; one Turk having taken improper liberties with the wife of a Corfiote, the husband remonstrated, and was immediately shot by the enraged Turk, who, in his turn, was killed by a Greek; the tumult became general, and many lives were lost on both sides. (p. 30.) Our author's account of Ithaca is very interesting, though purposely rendered brief, as he visited that island in company with Sir William Gell, who has so ably described it. “There cannot,” says Mr. Dodwell, (p. 63.) “be a more accurate description of the approach to Ithaca, and of its great port, than that given by Homer.” (*Odyss.* xiii. v. 95, &c.) Among ancient ruins in Ithaca, the local tradition related that treasures of gold, and gigantic skeletons had been found; and Mr. D. some years after his return, saw many articles of gold, silver, and bronze, which the sepulchres of that island had furnished; one was a silver cup, of embossed workmanship: there were beautiful fibulæ, ear-rings, necklaces, and other trinkets, all seemingly executed in the best times, when feminine ornaments were finely worked;

Ορμον δ' Ευρυμαχῷ πολυδαίδαλον αὐτικ' ἐνεῖκε,

Χρυσέον.

(*Hom. Odyss.* xviii. v. 294.)

At Mesaloggion a Greek was introduced to Mr. D. as a man of consummate learning, “*σοφιστάτος ἀνθρώπος*,” who during the whole day repeated lines from Tasso, Metastasio, and other Italian poets, but could not recite one verse of Homer, nor, in fact, did he understand the ancient language of his country. But the schoolmaster of that place, Gregorio Palama, was conversant with the Hellenic, and (says Mr. D. p. 89.) quoted several authors in a pompous, pedantic manner, “pronouncing the eta and omega generally short; the epsilon and omikron long. He

made *Ὀμῆρος* three short syllables, and treated with the utmost contempt my barbarous and prosodiacal manner of pronunciation, calling it northern kakophonia." From the work of Guiliatore, who travelled in 1669, our author quotes a passage, proving that the system of mutual instruction, which we term Lancasterian, was at that time practised in Athens. (p. 90.) Near Mesaloggion are the remains of an ancient city; its original name is extremely dubious; "the learned of Mesaloggion will have it (says Mr. D. p. 99.) to be Calydon; and were angry and disappointed when I proved to them that Calydon was situated several miles from this spot, on the banks of the Evenos." Whatever city it may have been, the walls are eight feet thick, composed of large and well-united stones, some nine feet in length, and filled inside with smaller stones and rubbish, forming a durable mass. This is the *emplecton* of Vitruvius, which he says the Greeks did not use, but, Mr. Dodwell thinks, erroneously, as he had seen it in some walls of high antiquity. (p. 97.)

At Patra our author lodged at the house of Mr. Strani, the consul, whence it was his intention to proceed through Achaia and Corinth to Athens; but the plague had appeared at Corinth, and he relinquished his design. It is indeed surprising, as Mr. D. observes, "that Greece is ever free from this scourge, when we consider the infernal means which are taken to propagate and spread it far and wide for the profit of a few wretches, the most nefarious of the human race; I allude to the lower class of Jews and Albanians." These, having escaped two or three attacks of the plague, feel so fortified against it, (every successive attack being weaker than the preceding,) that they do not fear to enter the houses of deceased persons for the sake of plunder: they will purchase or steal the infected clothes, and are appointed to bury those who have died of the plague; "they have been discovered dipping sponges and rags into the blood and matter of the dead, and throwing them into the windows of houses which had the reputation of being wealthy, thus hoping to destroy the inmates, and become possessors of their effects. Mr. Strani actually saw an Albanian throw an infected sponge into his window, and it was by mere chance and good fortune that he and all his family did not fall a sacrifice." (p. 113.) At Galaxidi, (36 miles from Patra,) "I rose," says Mr. D., "at day-break, impatient to view our situation; the first object which struck me, (and I shall never forget it,) was Mount Parnassos towering above the clouds, and covered with snow. The Phædriades rocks were visible, and the great fissure near the Kastalian spring." (p. 130.) It will be observed that our author here

(as throughout his work) prefers the Greek terminations in *os* and *on*, to the Latin *us* and *um*, wherever he can adopt them without an appearance of pedantry or affectation; the Greek *K*, also, he uses, rather than the Latin *C*, and the *U* instead of *Y*, where they do not deviate too widely from the established custom. We may remark, too, that he has purposely omitted the Greek accents in his quotations, because such marks have not the sanction of high antiquity; "they are supposed to be the invention of the grammarian Aristophanes, and are never seen upon inscriptions of any kind." (Pref. p. iv.) As a specimen of the common Greek epistolary writing, Mr. D. copies a letter of introduction from the Bishop of Salona to the Papas of Kastri. This modern Greek, however, is accented.—*εὐλαβεσάτε παπὰ κύρ Ιωάννη σέ εὐχόμεθα. αὐτοῦ ἔρχονται οἱ παροντες ἐγκλέξοι μηλόρδοι, καὶ ἔχουν νά σιργιανίσουν. καὶ θελεῖς τοὺς περιποιηθῇ ὅτι εἶναι ἀνθρώποι τιμημένοι καὶ εὐγενεῖς. εἰς ἡμᾶς εἶναι συστημένοι ἀπὸ τὸν κοῦσολον ἐγκλέξον καὶ ἦλθαν ἀπὸ πάτρων. ταῦτα. καὶ ἡ παρ' ἡμῶν εὐχὴ εἴη σοι. φερουαρίου εὐχῆς σου.* "Most holy Papas, Mr. John, we give you our benediction. These English milords have come here; they are going to travel. You will receive them well, for they are men both honorable and noble. They are recommended to us by the English Consul, and they are come from Patra. That is all we have to say, and our benediction be with you. February. Your Benedictor." (p. 165.)

To the account of Delphi our ingenious author devotes the sixth chapter of his first volume; and it forms a highly interesting portion of this work. We must here observe that he censures Francklin and others, who, as he thinks without authority, have written Delphos, for Delphi; and he refers to Bentley on Phalaris. (Pref. p. 90.) Besides Delphi, this celebrated city and oracle bore the names of Pytho, Python, and Pythia. Among the ruins, at the base of the tremendous precipices of Mount Parnassos, is the "inspired and inspiring" Kastalian spring, *Κρήνη τῆς Κασταλίας*. (Strabo). "The next spot," says Mr. D., "which I was impatient to visit, was the temple of Apollo—at least the site of it; for the remains of this celebrated edifice have vanished like a dream, leaving not a trace behind. It was in the upper part of the town, (Pausan. x. 32.) and near a magnificent theatre, which, indeed, was within its peribolos. The Grecian theatres are generally hewn out of the solid rock, and are therefore the most indestructible of ancient monuments; I had reason to hope I should find it, and that it would lead to the discovery of the temple; but I was disappointed, as I could not discover any positive traces of either one or the

other. It appears that the far-famed temple of Apollo must be sought for under the humble cottages of Kastri, as the whole village probably stands within its ancient peribolos." (p. 174.) The great edifice, which has thus wholly disappeared, was once the common temple, "*το ιερον κοινον*," the common oracle of the human race, "*commune humani generis oraculum*," which, with its god, its rites of sacrifice, and the predominance of superstition, enriched the barren rocks of Parnassos beyond the most fertile and cultivated fields or plains: even in Homer's time the wealth of Delphi was proverbial—its temple yielded almost a million sterling of plunder to the Phocians, a sum enormous in those days! Apollo frustrated the attempt of Xerxes to pillage the treasures accumulated at his shrine, but Sylla obtained them; yet, after subsequent depredations, three thousand statues remained at Delphi in the time of Pliny: one hundred and thirty-seven are described by Pausanias; but when he wrote, the temple was destitute of money, "and the rich offerings of Gyges, Alyattes, Cræsus, and Midas, with the accumulated liberality of kings and of nations, could be seen no more. Even the Phrygians, Lydians, Persians, Assyrians, Phœnicians, the Italians, and the Hyperboreans themselves, sent offerings to Delphi." (p. 176.) Yet a traveller can scarcely find sufficient traces of Apollo's temple, once among the most celebrated edifices of the world, to authorise a bare conjecture respecting its position. We may, however, suppose it to have been magnificent, as even the rebuilding of it by Spintarus (about 512 years before Christ) is said to have cost nearly three hundred talents. The Apollo Belvedere is thought to be a copy from the statue of the Delphic temple; and this original, in the opinion of the famous Canova, was of bronze—some circumstances, particularly in the drapery, indicating a style suitable to metal rather than to marble. Masses of ancient walls, and terraces with foundations of streets and houses, may yet be discovered among the ruins of Delphi; many curiosities are undoubtedly buried under the modern village of Kastri, and numerous fragments of fine terracotta vases are found in all their pristine freshness. Mr. D. also discovered here some part of a marble statue, and was fortunate in procuring from the peasants several rare coins. (p. 191). But we cannot follow our accomplished antiquary as closely as we could wish, throughout his classic wanderings; his arrival at a spot where three hills and three roads meet, and where some large stones indicate perhaps the tomb of Laios, must here be noticed: .

Notice of Dodwell's

Ω τρεις κελευθοι, και κεκρυμμενη ναπη,
Δρυμος τε, και στενωπος εν τριπλαις οδοις.

(Sophocl. Œd. TYR. v. 1411).

Apollodorus calls this place *Στην οδος*, which is also its modern name. (p. 198). We must pass over his visit to Panopeus, and Libadea, and place him at the oracular cavern of Trophonius, where, he says, it is almost certain that the subterraneous wonders and curiosities of that place might be brought to light by a little expense and perseverance. (p. 218.) Chæroneia, Orchomenos, the 'treasury of Minyas, Helicon, Thespeia, Haliartos, and Thebes, furnish many interesting subjects of observation to Mr. Dodwell; his account of Athens, and the celebrated spots in its vicinity, we most particularly recommend to the attention of our readers—it will delight on perusal any where; but must prove a treasure of instruction and information to those who may hereafter be so fortunate as to visit the Attic metropolis — It fills nearly half of the first volume, and though chiefly composed, as may well be imagined, of antiquarian descriptions and illustrations of classic authors, yet it affords many entertaining anecdotes and miscellaneous remarks. Among the modern Athenians Mr. D. observed some extraordinary superstitions and magical ceremonies: he one day found in the inner chamber of an ancient sepulchre, which the Greeks regard as haunted by the *Μοιραι* or Destinies, two Turkish women who had just offered to the redoubted sisters "a small feast, consisting of a cup of honey and white almonds, a cake on a little napkin, and a vase of aromatic herbs, burning and exhaling an agreeable perfume. This votive offering was placed upon a rock, which was cut and flat at top, and was probably originally an altar or table, on which an annual sacrificial ceremony was performed by the relations of the deceased." (p. 397). Having mentioned the philtres given by women to conciliate the affections of men; the caverns which have peculiar virtues in providing the fair votaries with husbands, in rendering parturition prosperous, and procuring male offspring; the offerings and rites used in malignant incantations, to gratify malice or revenge (among which are the means employed in causing a woman to bring forth female children only, a circumstance esteemed particularly unfortunate); our traveller remarks, that "it would be useless to enumerate the various magical rites practised by the modern Greeks; it will be sufficient to notice one more, in which they place great faith. When a feast is given, and there is a roasted lamb, which is generally a standing dish, the shoulder or blade bones are

scraped bare, when certain fibrous marks are curiously scrutinised, in order to presage the fortune of the master of the feast. This is termed *πλατομαντεια*, or the shoulder-bone prediction, and seems to be a remnant of the *ιερισκοπια*, or inspection of victims. Pennant describes this mode of divination as practised in the highlands of Scotland, where it is called *sleinanacha*, or divination by the spall-bone; but with them the seer, or second-sighted person, looks through the thin part of the bone, and sees future events as in a vision." (p. 399.) Here we find the same superstition existing at once in the north and in the south of Europe—but it may be far more widely traced; for we learn from Sir William Ouseley, that the mode of divination, by means of a half-burnt sheep's blade-bone, (which the Persians call *sháneh i gúsfand*) has long been practised by all nations of Scythian origin. He quotes various authors to show its prevalence throughout various countries of Asia; and, from a Ms. of the thirteenth century, he informs us that the mighty *Chengiz Khan* highly esteemed such a manner of ascertaining future events; and this "barbarian monarch," adds he, "was once deterred for some time from a projected invasion of Hindustan, by unfavorable signs appearing on the *sháneh*, which he had consulted. On such a trifling circumstance depended the fate of millions!" (Ouseley's Trav. Vol. 1. p. 312.)

Respecting the spoliation or dilapidation, and in some instances the destruction, of many venerable Athenian edifices, Mr. Dodwell speaks with all the warmth of a zealous antiquary; and according to his report, the removal of those admirable sculptures, which so highly decorated the temples, excited indignation not only among the Greeks, but even among the Turks of Athens. The year 1801 was fatal to the glories of the Parthenon; Mr. D. was on the spot when the dilapidation took place, "and had an opportunity (he says, p. 323.) of observing, and indeed of participating in the sentiment of indignation which such conduct universally inspired. The whole proceeding was so unpopular in Athens, that it was necessary to pay the laborers more than their usual profits before any could be prevailed upon to assist in this work of profanation."—The Parthenon, Mr. D. assures us, was not in danger of suffering from the barbarism either of Greeks or Turks; for both respected it; the former as a building which had once been dedicated, as a Christian church, to Saint George; and the latter as a place converted by the Mahomedan conquerors of Athens into a mosque. We have, however, the consolation of knowing, that the sculptures taken from those ancient monuments have not been de-

stroyed ; and the public may at any time inspect the Elgin marbles preserved in our great national Museum. But what are we to say of the havoc, the absolute destruction, caused by a French traveller at Sparta ? We allude to a circumstance, in explanation of which we must suddenly pass from the first to the second volume of Mr. Dodwell's work, and accompany him on a visit to the modern town of Misithra, where he lodged in the house of Demetrio Manusaki, a man of consequence and property, proud of his Spartan ancestors, in honor of whom he had named one of his sons Lycurgus, and another Leonidas, while he taught them the Hellenic language. With this person as a guide, Mr. D. explored the riches of Sparta ; and having copied some inscriptions, he observed that his companion " turned them over and concealed them under stones and bushes. When I inquired his motive for such unusual caution, he informed me that he did it in order to preserve them ; because many years ago a French *milordos*, who visited Sparta, after having copied a great number of inscriptions, had the letters chiselled out and defaced. He actually pointed out to me some fine slabs of marble, from which the inscriptions had evidently been thus barbarously erased." (p. 405.) This fact was mentioned at Misithra by several other persons ; and Mr. Dodwell is unquestionably right in imputing it to the Abbé Fourmont, who travelled in 1729 by order of Louis XV. Indeed the Abbé's own letters, which are preserved with his journal in the Bibliothèque du Roi at Paris, condemn him ; for he boasts of having destroyed the inscriptions, that they might not be copied by any future traveller. He also declares that he had employed often thirty, forty, or sixty workmen, in demolishing the ancient monuments not only of Sparta, but of Hermione, Trezene, Tyrius, and other places. "*Je n'avois que ce moyen là pour rendre illustre mon voyage,*" &c. But this mean, selfish, and unjustifiable operation has not been attended with all the success that the Abbé anticipated ; for although some learned Frenchmen have defended the authenticity of his inscriptions, it is believed by many that his principal object in defacing the marbles was, that he might, without danger of detection, blend forgery with truth ; and accordingly we find two most competent judges, Mr. Knight and Lord Aberdeen, treat as literary frauds the inscriptions of Fourmont, which furnish internal evidence against their own authenticity.—(See Knight's Analysis of the Greek Alphabet, and Lord Aberdeen on the Amyclæan marbles, in Walpole's Memoirs relating to European and Asiatic Turkey.)

We must here close Mr. Dodwell's work, reserving his

second volume for a future occasion ; it affords, like the first, a multiplicity of curious and interesting passages, and is illustrated with many beautiful engravings : indeed, besides an excellent map of Greece, (by Walker,) the two volumes contain sixty-six copper plates, and forty-eight wood cuts ; and their typographical execution reflects much credit on Messrs. Rodwell and Martin. We shall take another opportunity of noticing the Imperial folio Atlas of Mr. Dodwell's admirable Views in Greece ; consisting of thirty large plates, colored in exact imitation of drawings, and illustrated each with a descriptive page of letter-press, French and English : but this, though referring to the two quarto volumes, is a work perfectly distinct, and sold separately.

NUGÆ.

No. II.—[Continued from No. XLVIII. p. 389.]

ORTHOGRAPHY OF SILVA.

Non nostrum tantas componere lites—to use the formula of a sceptical friend of ours, “ we shall not express any opinion on this controverted topic, not having considered the subject.” We shall only submit, that the mode of spelling which we have employed above, appears to us to have owed some of its popularity, on the Continent at least, to an unconscious habit of accommodating the orthography of the ancient Latin to the genius of the writer's (or editor's) own language ; *i* being substituted for *y* in most French and Italian words derived from the Latin.

Of this species of depravation we have many instances in our own language. Such, for instance, is the usage of “ *solemnis*” for “ *solemnus* ;” although this is not perhaps in all cases attributable to corruption. A late French editor of Virgil (who by the way is severe on the verbal errors of former editions, and on those of the Elzevir, we think, rather unjustly so) has printed *Thybris* for *Tybris* throughout. Is this a Gallicism ?

— Pudet hæc opprobria nobis
Et dici potuisse, et non potuisse refelli.

Where is this often-quoted sentence to be found ? We conclude, from its having passed muster safely for so many ages, that it is of genuine classical growth ; otherwise we should be almost disposed to protest against *nobis* as a barbarism.

In Milton's Latin poem on the Gunpowder Plot, the lines (137-8)

Cum somnos pepulit stellatæ janitor aulæ,
Nocturnos visus, et somnia grata revolvens,

Warton, from his explanation in the note, appears to understand "janitor" of the morning star ("admonitor operum") or some other such sleep-dispersing agent. But "stellatæ janitor aulæ" is no other than the Pope, who was newly awakening from his dream.¹ "Revolvens" appears to mean "revolving or considering in his mind."

In the fine chorus of *Samson Agonistes*, l. 687,

Nor only dost degrade them, and remit
To life obscured, which were a fair dismission,

we know not that any of the commentators has noticed the allusion to the "honesta missio" of the Romans. "When the soldiers had served out their time,—the foot twenty years, and the horse ten, they were called *Emeriti*, and obtained their discharge. This was called *missio honesta vel justa*." Adam's *Antiq.* p. 362. The *Samson* is altogether a singular poem; a drama on the Greek model, by an English poet, on a Hebrew subject; and the perpetual intermixture of Hebrew history with classical metaphor and allusion, produces a peculiar, and sometimes a heterogeneous effect. It is altogether a truly Miltonian work, and deserves a more adequate criticism than has been hitherto bestowed on it.

On the lines to Queen Christina, (which Voltaire² by the way ascribes to "Marvell, célèbre poëte Anglois,") l. 5. "Inviafatorum dum per vestigia nitor," &c. some passages from the Sonnets might perhaps be quoted as apposite; especially the opening of Sonnet XVI. "Cromwell, our chief of men," &c. Warton has allowed a number of unscholar-like errata to escape him, in his edition of Milton's Latin Poems; such are "turpe" for "turpi," p. 504, "barrathrum," p. 506, "Lybicosque," p. 512.

¹ So l. 98, "Cui reserata patet convexi janua cœli."

² Some of Voltaire's classical *σφαλματα* are sufficiently amusing. In ridiculing the extravagancies of the *Odyssey*, he describes Ulysses (Od. vi.) as walking *naked* by the side of Nausicaa's chariot. And he explodes the story of Dido as a Grecian invention, because the names Dido, Sichæus, and Pygmalion are—Greek!

in No. XL. p. 544, art. II. an extraordinary anecdote of William the Conqueror is quoted from Matthew Paris. The same story is noticed by Milton, whose comment however on this, and some other relations of the monks, is doubtless founded in justice: "These are things related of Alexander and Cæsar, and I doubt thence borrowed by the monks to inlay their story." The reader may be amused with the following new version of the fable of the Danaïdes, which our historian transcribes, among other legendary fictions, relative to the ancient history of this island. "These daughters, by appointment of Danaüs, on the marriage-night, having murdered all their husbands, except Lynceus, whom his wife's loyalty saved, were by him at the suit of his wife their sister, not put to death, but turn'd out to sea in a ship *unmann'd*; of *which whole sea*¹ they had incurr'd the hate; and as the tale goes, were driv'n on this island: where the inhabitants, none but devils, as some write, or as others, a lawless crew left here by Albion, without head or governor," (Spenser's description of the aboriginal inhabitants of Britain) "both entertain'd them, and had issue by them, a second breed of giants, who tyrannis'd the isle, till Brutus came." Book 1. p. 10 ed. 1677.

BOINTOS.

PUERILIA.

No. III.—[Continued from No. XLVIII. p. 390.]

— nōva proles
Artubus infirmis teneras lasciva per herbas
Ludit. Lucret. i. 260

1.—*Admonitus locorum.*

QUIS tantus calor, aut tacito quæ in corde voluptas
Exoritur, gratis incendens pectora curis,
Quum vacuas patrum sedes, augusta subimus
Lamina, quos olim sacer insignibat Apollo,
Quæve innumpta sacra Pallas cingebat oliva?
Sed tristes campos, veterique rubentia Marte
Littora lustremus, graciles Marathonis olivas,

¹ The reader will not fail to notice this truly Grecian usage.

Œtæosve apices, aut anfractus Trasimeni,
 Aut Trebiæ salices, aut Leucados Actia saxa?
 Quis per Olympiaci deserta silentia campi
 Vadat, Agenores nec notos carmine cursus
 Ante oculos fulgere putet, lateque citato
 Fervere littus equo, et raucum increbrescere murmur?
 Quis tacitus Smyrnæ scopulos, Lesboaque calcet
 Littora, quis Siculo cultam pastore Arethusam?
 O ubi dulcè nemus Camoëntis, et obsita vite
 Avia, qua tacitæ sub amico sidere Lunæ
 Solus iit, chordaque leves prælusit amores,
 Jam jam sublata dicturus Iasona penna
 Lusiadum! o qui me gelidis in vallibus Arni
 Sistat, et Etrusci pandat vestigia vatis,
 Qui Phlegethonteum sicco mare lumine vidit,
 Cœlestemque domum, et triplicis penetralia mundi!

En, ubi Benaci ripam et placida arva Viator,
 Quemque rigat campum fluvio Tiberinus amœno,
 Lustrat, et Ausoniæ quærît vestigia famæ,
 Huc illuc volvens oculos; dumque omnia visit,
 Sylvasque, scopulosque, et aprico gramine colles,
 Ingruit insolitus timor, et formidine sacra
 Corda rigent; canam patrum increbrescere turbam
 Aspicit, atque omni Manes glomerantur in aura.
 Incumbit sacer horror aquis: effunditur Echo
 - Clarior, atque altæ spirant nova carmina rupes.¹
 Sic Indus patrii deserta ad littora ponti,²
 Quum ventus silet, et placido innatat æquore lumen,
 Stagna tuens, sedesque quietas, atria vastæ
 Subdita Neptuno, veterum monumenta virorum,
 Aut videt aut vidisse putat, fulgentiaque auro
 Minatur tecta, et virides sub gurgite sylvas.

Pieridum mater, salve, quæ temporis acti
 Scis nebulam arripere, et vario vestire colore!
 Salve, magna vicum nutrix: salve, omnia in unum
 Quæ potes aggerere, atque tuis dare sæcula Musis!
 Te vates fovet; insequitur te sancta Cupido,
 Æmula te virtus, et vivida laudis imago.

* * * * *

2. Εὐρου ὑπὸ πνοιῇσι καὶ ἡλίῳ ἀνίοντι
 κεῖται γῆ πολύπυρος, ἐπήρατος· ἐν δέ τε πολλὰ

εἰσὶ πόλεις· Ἰνδῶ δὲ δεδαΐαται εὐρὺ ρέοντι,
 Ἰάγγητός τε ρῆσσι διΐπετέος ποταμοῖο.
 ἔνθ' Ἐλέφαντος ἰς τρέφεται δεινοῖο πελωροῦ·
 ὃς νόμου ἐν βήσση πολυπίδακος ἡματα πάντα
 ναίει, πᾶρ δ' ὑλῆσιν ὁμοχρονηῖσι τελευτᾷ.
 μηκέτι δ' αὖ πάντων ὄγ' ὑπείρεχει ἔθνεα θηρῶν
 τόσσον, ὅσον σκοπελοῦ λευκὸν κάρη ἡλιβατοῖο
 νῆας ὑπερκύπτει, αἶτε πλώωνται ὑπ' αὐτῆς.¹
 τῷ δὲ δυ' εἰσὶν ὄδοντες ἀπὸ κρατὸς προέχουσαι,
 γναμπταί, λευκοτάται, περιμηκέες· οὐδέ τι ταύρου·
 οὐδέ τι πανθήρας ὅγε δείδιεν, οὐδέ λέοντας·
 τόσσον ἐπὶ σθενεῖ προφέρει, τρομέουσι δὲ πάντες.
 τῷ δὲ ζωῆς τέρμα πολυχρονιώτατόν· ἔστι
 πάντων, ὅστα πέφυκεν ἐπὶ χθονὸς εὐρυοδείης.
 ἡελίου δ' ὅταν ἀκρὸν ἦ φάος, ἔνθα καθ' ὕλην
 κεῖται, ὅθι πλατανοί τε, ἴδε λωτοὶ τανύφυλλοι,
 καὶ δρύες ὑψικόμοι, κέδρων τ' αἰπεινὰ κάρηνα·
 ἡμος δ' ἐξανήσιν ἐν αἰθέρι διὰ Σελήνη,
 τῆμος ἐφ' ὕδατα καλὰ, ῥόους θ' ἀλιμυρῆεντας,
 ἦλθε τε, δῖψαν τ' ἔσχε, καὶ αὐτόθ' ἔλε γλυκὺν ὕπνον.
 Τὸν δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν ἀνδρῶν δάμασε σθένος, ἐκ δὲ ἔ πάτρη·
 ἠγαγεν (ἢ ὄγ' ἀπ' Ἰνδοῦ ἀριπρεπέων λειμώνων,
 ἢ ἀπὸ Ἰαπροβάνης πολυδεϊδρέου εἰλήλουθεν·)
 ἔνθ' ἐν ἀγυαῖσιν μεγάλων φέρει ἄρματ' ἀνάκτων,
 δαιδαλέα, χρύσεια· βροτῶν δ' ἐπὶ τόνδε τρέπονται
 παντόθεν ὀφθαλμοί· θαυμάζει δ' εἴτις ὁδίτης
 ἢ ἀπ' Ἰβήρου κεῖθι μολῶν ἔτυχ', ἢ ἀπὸ Ῥηνοῦ.
 αὐτὸς δ' ἐν θυμῷ ποθέει πατρώϊον ὕλην,
 καὶ πηγὰς ποταμῶν, καὶ πῖσθα ποιήεντα.²
 πολλακὶ δ' ἐς πολέμους ὀρμᾷ, περιειμένος ἀλκήν·

* * * * *

3.—*Isai.* xiv. 4.

Φεῦ φεῦ· τυράννων ὡς ὕβρις κατέφθιται,
 ἀρχαιοπλουτος δ' ἐξανέστραπται πόλις·
 ἀνδρῶν δ' ἀνάγων σκῆπτρ' ἀπέβρηξεν Θεός,
 θρόνους τ' ἐνέστρεψ'. ὃς δ' ἀνηνύτοις κακῶν
 ῥιπαῖσι λαοὺς καὶ πόλεις ἐχείμασε,
 σμερδναῖς γόλου ῥιπαῖσι διανέμων κράτη,
 οὐδ' αὐτὸς εὔρεν ἐν κακοῖς ἀμύντορα.
 ἀμπνῇ δὲ γαῖα, κάξαπῆλλακται πόνων·

¹ This simile is from Hoyle's Exodiad.

² Hom. Il. τ. 9.

φλέγει δὲ παιᾶν· αἱ δὲ Λιβανίτιδες
 κέδροι βοῶσι, καὶ βαθυρρίζοι πίτυς,
 χαρὰ θανόντος· πᾶν δ' ἐπωλολύξατο
 βένθος νάπαιον· — Ἐξότου γὰρ ὄλλυσαι,
 οὔτις τόμειωσ ἀνῆλθεν εἰς ἐμ' ἀμφιπλήξ
 σίδηρος, ὕλης ἐξαμῶν ἀγάλατα· —
 μακρὸν δ' ἔνερθεν Ἑρεβος ἐξανίσταται,
 τῇ σῇ ξυναυτῶν εἰσοδῶ, φυλάς δ' ὁμοῦ
 κινεῖ θανόντων, τοὺς τε πρυμνήτας χθονὸς
 τοὺς πρόσθε, δημάρχους τε, καὶ βουλευφόρους·
 εὐθὺς δ' ἀφ' ἔδρας πᾶς τις ἐξέστη πρόμων,
 τοιοῖσδε μύθοις· — Ἡ σὺ γὰρ τὰ νῦν πέλεις
 ἡμῖν ὅμοιος; ἢ σέ γ', ὡς ἡμᾶς, κράτους
 ἡμερσε θάνατος; μουσικῆς δέ σοι γλυκὺς
 φθόγγος πέπαυται, χῆ πολύχρυσος χλιδὴ;
 ἴπες δέ σοι κάτωθεν ἔστρωνται λέχος,
 ἴπες δ' ἄνωθεν; ὦ κάκιστα δὴ σφαλεῖς
 πάντων, ὅσοι περ ἐν βροτοῖς εἶχον κράτη·

* * * * *

CAMBRIDGE TRIPOSES

FOR FEB. 1822.

MEDORA CONRADO

ACCIPE, quam mittit tibi fida Medora, salutem
 Mittit enim profugo, qua caret ipsa, viro :
 Te peterem infelix, possem modo, crede, per undas
 Sciret amor nullas, me properante, moras.
 O si verba tui audisses suprema parentis,
 Nec mea jecisses vota ferenda Noto ;
 Aëra fatidicis implevi ut mœsta querelis,
 Et tremuere novi præscia corda mali.
 Vera nimis timor! quanto sævire tumultu
 Æquora tum primum visa fuere maris ;
 Abripuit quum læva meis te cymba lacertis,
 Languida nec potuit dextra tenere fugam.
 Immemor in scopulis interto lumine sedi,
 Et fugit, me non respiciente, ratis.
 Cur juvat oblitum exiguos sprevisse penates ?
 Quid patria profugum cogit abesse domo ?

Non habet uxoris trepidum lenire dolorem,
 Non habet aut curas fama levare tuas.
 Forsitan hos ipsos culpabis, perfide, questus,
 Forsitan et crimen sint mea verba tibi :
 Quid loquor infelix ? te spernere posse Medoram,
 Pellicis et fœdo ludere velle sinu ?
 Ipsa etiam neglecta novo conjungar amore,
 Et discam miseros pellicis ipsa dolos :
 Impia vox absit ! quo me furor urget amantem :
 Heu læsus, quod vix cogitat, edit amor :
 Non dum vita mihi, dum sanguine vena calebit,
 Deseret infidum fida Medora virum.
 Te propter decus illa, patrem, nomenque reliquit,
 Sed mihi tu nomen, tu pater unus eras.
 Ah ! quoties animo prisci revocantur amores,
 Intactæque domus, virgineique tori,
 Ingenuæ fraudes, et quæ tulit hora beatæ
 Lætæ juventutis : sed semel illa fuit !
 Cur mihi delicias placeat revocare priores,
 Nescio ; sed memini, nec meminisse piget.
 Sæpe diem tardum increpui, si longus abesses ;
 'Turturis ah, dixi, si mihi penna foret,—
 Te neque desererem, vita mihi carior ipsa,
 At cuperem lethi vel comes esse tui !
 Nunc etiam sequerer, sinerent modo fata : nec album
 Incuteret pelagi sævior ira metum.
 Finderet horridas si fulmine Jupiter auras,
 Tecum etiam in medio fulmine tuta forem,
 Sive ratem insanis Aquilo submergeret undis,
 Suavis in amplexu mors foret ipsa tuo.
 Septima jam (memini) periit cum floribus æstas,
 Et glacie fluvios septima vinxit hyems ;
 Ex quo prima mihi occurrit tua forma per umbram,
 Motibus et sensi me trepidare novis.
 Obstupui : ignotoque prius caluere tumultu
 Pectora : vox hæsit ; contremuere sinus ;
 Ros quoque per gelidas visus mihi serpere alas
 Et vicibus crebris ire, redire color ;
 Impleri aures incerto murmure sensi,
 Membraque vix tremuli sustinuerunt pedes.
 Hinc animum fugit requies, hinc lumina somnus
 Omnia, ni lacrymas, abstulit ille dies.
 Te lacrymæ movere meæ, movere querelæ ;
 Et stetit in vultu plûrima gutta tuo.

Cur ego mellitas accepi credula voces ?

Ah ! nimium credit sæpe, quod optat, Amor.

Nunc surdi meditata vagor prope litora ponti,

Et posco abreptum, quem tenet unda, virum.

Nec fugiunt miseram, Phœbo fugiente, dolores ;

Et piget in viduo ponere membra toro.

• Opprimor, assuetos nequicquam experta labores ;

Invitaque cadit pendula tela manu.

Nec juvat, ut quondam, patrias celebrasse choreas,

Serta nec auratis implicuisse comis.

Sed rapior, quocunque furor me pectoris urget ;

Nec scopuli tardam, nec facit unda, moram.

Ipsi etiam miseras venti dīdicere querelas ;

Has gerit et levibus quælibet aura sonis :

Has amor insanus male fida inscribit arena ;

Invida nam caras eluit unda uotas.

Si vagor in tacito sylvarum mœsta recessu,

Obvenit hic media nota figura via ;

Sæpe per obscuras noctis volitare tenebras,

Ludere et in tremulis sæpe videtur aquis.

Si fugio per saxa, ferunt mihi saxa maritum ;

Te mihi, te solum, noxque diesque refert.

Quumque tuo hærentem gremio mea somnia fingunt,

Suscitor e gelido sola relicta toro,

— Ah ! quoties timui, fremeret simul aura procella

Indueretque novas sævior unda minas !

Ah ! quoties timui Zephyrum præsaga susurrum !

Quam rabiem ventis addidit ipse timor !

Profiuit heu ! neque forma mihi, neque gratia lingua,

Nec mihi conjugium (nomen inane) meum ;

Nil potuit læsi jurata cupidinis ara ;

Cogor enim profugum flere Medora virum.

Heu ! melius periisse semel, quam, conjuge raptō,

Tristia per longos tendere fila dies !

Et moriar ; quoniam lacrymas sibi mortua poscet,

Quas nunquam potuit viva, Medora tuas.

Attamen amplectus vellem tenuisse supremos,

Inque tuo moriens procubuisse sinu.—

Ne lapis inciso narret mea fata sepulcro ;

Sed vigeat sacro lætior herba solo :

Illic et pueris teneræ dent vota puellæ ;

Vota sub auspiciis fida futura loci ;

Et “ Nobis ” clament, tumulto ut solennia ponunt

Dona, “ fides par sit ! sit magis æquus Amor.”

FONS EGERIÆ.

Δηοῖ δ' οὐκ ἀπὸ παντὸς ὕδωρ φορέουσι Μελισσαι,
 'Ἄλλ' ἥ τις καθαρὴ τε καὶ ἀχράντος ἀνέρπει
 Πίδακος ἐξ ἱερῆς ὀλίγη λιβύς, ἄκρον ἕωτον.

Callim. Hymn. ad Apollinem.

CASTALII latices, et florea culmina Pindi
 Nescio qua præter solitum dulcedine lentos
 Detinuere pedes: lymphatam somnia mentem;
 Quæ circumvolitant Musarum templa, catenis
 Vinxerunt roseis;—at nunc tua linquimus arva,
 Delie, vocalemque lyram sociasque choreas:
 Inclyte Phœbe vale, Phœbique valete sorores.

Nam Faunos Dryadasque voco facilesque Napæas,
 Numina sylvarum: tranquillam ducere vitam
 Queis cordi est, rurisque læves celebrare triumphos:
 Dum molles violas et, quæ nascuntur in umbra
 Muscosos fontes inter nemorumque latebras,
 Lilia, veris opes, miscent viridantibus herbis.

Te, licet invitus, dignam meliore camœna,
 Pastori Siculo dilectam, Arethusa, silebo:
 Nec temere occultos narrare licebit amores,
 Quos numeris olim sacros fecere poëtæ.

Littus ad Ausonium, qua temperat aura Favoni
 Ardentes radios et fervida tela diei,
 Qua bifervis splendent fragrantia sarta rosetis,
 Deliciæ veris, maturaque munera Floræ,
 Ultro Phantasiæ rapior surgentibus alis.

Vallis Aricina, antiquis circumdata sylvis,
 Apparet tibi miranti placidosque recessus,
 Et virides umbras, atque impendentia saxa,
 Advena;—fundit aquas tenues de pumice vivo
 Fons sacer, et leni decurrunt flumina lapsu,
 Quæ recreant herbam sitientem aspergine lymphæ.
 Scilicet insomni mulcet fons murmuræ opacas
 Numinis ætherii sedes, penetralia luci:
 Undique læta virent, pronus qua defluit amnis
 Arbusta, humoremque bibunt fruticeta benignum
 Imbris perpetui; sparsæ tum copia guttæ
 Floribus insidit, viridique in margine ripæ
 Late spirat odor, supra volitantibus auris.
 Sed nunquam, Philomela, tui modulamina cantus
 Intima per dumeta sonant, liquidæque querelæ;
 Centusque silent avium, quæ murmura fontis

Æternumque loci florentis numen adorant,
 Carminis oblitæ soliti : frondente renidet
 Ver adeo in sylva, tacitusque ita ducitur annus.
 O prædulce nemus, riguique silentia saltus,
 Quæ vespertini suspiria languida venti
 Haud rumpunt : veneranda loci mysteria gressu
 Sacrilego longe metuunt violare coloni ;
 Nec quisquam teneros pastor cum matribus agnos
 Palantesque boves in sacra umbracula ducit.
 Quam placidum ridet nitidæ pellacia lymphæ
 Populeos subter ramos !—argentea Luna
 Sola suo penetrat secretam lumine sylvam :
 Lampade pallenti noctis tranquilla relucet
 Unda simul, tenuique recumbit leniter alveo.
 Nec, si forte sitim moveat ferventior æstus,
 Has avis ingenuas rostrum demittit in undas,
 Exiguos quærens haustus ; nec lubrica turbant
 Decidua frondes aut lapsus ab arbore ramus
 Vitra, repentinæ dudum secura procellæ.
 . Egeria est ;—venerare Deam : compesce molestas
 Voces, et pedibus fuge proculcare profanis
 Gramina, quæ ripas æterno vere coronant.
 Hic, fama est, olim sero sub vespere quærens
 Lucorum tenebras vacuique silentia ruris
 Nympha diu latuit, viridique occulta recessu
 Undantem proprio sacrauit nomine fontem.
 Sæpe dea huc veniens, lectum præbentibus herbis,
 Per gelidas noctes fidum speravit amantem,
 Mortalique dedit cœlestem audire loquelam,
 Chara viro conjux non dedignata vocari.
 Quum tu, Nympha, Numæ sapientia jura tulisti,
 Tutamen patriæ, tremulo sub pectore ducens
 Mollia cum gratis animo suspiria verbis,
 Aure sonos avida mellitæ vocis amator
 Hæsit.—Amor leges sacras sancivit Amoris.
 O quæ lingua potest suaves narrare dearum
 Blanditias ?—oculus quis tali testis amor ?—
 Non nisi Luna fuit : tacita quæ lampade lustrans,
 Dum peragrat cœlum, frondosæ tegmina sylvæ,
 Luce vaga prodit festivæ gaudia noctis.
 Jamne igitur memorem te, pallida Luna, pudicam ?
 Quum placidis cernes oculis vultuque sereno
 Qualia marmoream faciem conspecta rubore
 Virgineo inficerent ; gelido tamen omnia risu

Despicias, et lusus jucundi conscia fulges,
Tæda Voluptatis nocturnæ, et lumen Amoris.
Te puer Endymion, pastor formosus, in arvis
Aspexit; faciem quando mirata venustam
Celsa reliquisti fulgentis limina cœli,
Arboreis Latmi contenta jacere sub umbris.

At vos, Egeriæ luci gelidæque cavernæ,
Somnia dedecorent nunquam fallacia Musa.
Languet adhuc, sensim liquidas diffusa per auras,
Grata quies; castusque locorum spiritus errat
Circum aras virides templa et deserta Dianæ.
Quin et in Hippolyti tumultum juvenescit odores
Perpetuos Zephyro spargens hyacinthus; et ornat
Sera comans narcissus inani flore sepulcrum,
Dum perit, invictusque viget;—tamen ossa quiescunt
Discerpti juvenis, nullo temerata tumultu:
Quippe manent vel adhuc sacrati numine saltus,
Elysiumque nemus, viva et spelunca Deorum.

Felicem Egeriam!—sola secretus in umbra
Sperabit vates facilem producere vitam;
Suavia qua tandem curas atrosque dolores
Gaudia decipient, incertaque murmura luctus
Deliciis somni brevibus pacata silebunt:
Scilicet alliciunt nota dulcedine mentem
Alta quies ruris, spes et lætabilis oti;
Illum etiam, liquido fonti Musæque vacantem,
In tenero sensus tranquilli gramine ripæ
Projectum retinent; undarum lubrica mulcet
Planities animum, et blandis affectibus implet.

O fortunatum! tibi sit sincera voluptas
Hoc procul a cœtu, misera procul urbe, remoto
Hospitia umbrarum purasque requirere lymphas:
Nempe adeo longos paulatim Nestoris annos
Felix perficies; et non inamabilis hospes
Propter aquas tremula Phœbes sub luce latebis
Oblitus vivorum, obliviscendus et illis.

ON THE FABLES OF ÆSOP AND BABRIAS.

No. I.

AMONG the works written for the instruction and amusement of mankind, the fables of Æsop hold no mean a place. In every corner of the old world, where the knowledge of letters has marked the first dawn of civilisation, there have not been wanting men to impart, and children to receive, with equal delight, the story and the moral of the fascinating fabulist.

Of the history of the writer, whose name is associated with all that is pleasing in the years of infancy, and the beauty of whose style will then only be despised, when the mind has lost the relish for simplicity, little is known; and even that little is so confused by treacherous tradition, that some have doubted even the existence of the author; who, though a slave, as reported by Herodotus, has gained the crown of never-dying fame,

To which the regal bauble, that men court,

Is but a splendid toy, or cap of folly.

Such, however, was the moral value set upon the fables of Æsop, and such their intellectual power,

To shed, around the prison's gloom, a ray

Golden as sun-set, and than morn more gay,

that the best of men and wisest of Grecian sages found ample amusement, between his condemnation and death, in turning into verse such fables as he chanced to recollect.

Of Socrates' power of versification some idea may be formed, when we are told that he was thought to have assisted Euripides in the composition of his tragedies. The remnants, however, of his muse are said to be preserved by Laertius in a solitary distich, not remarkable for any great excellence, in Hexameter and Pentameter. With this fact in view, some may be tempted to attribute to Socrates the fragments of Æsop's fables in Heroic measure preserved by Suidas, and hitherto unassigned to any author. Amongst the fables, however, first published by De-Furia from a MS. in the Vatican, there exists one, so completely the counterpart of that which is given by Xenophon in his Memorabilia, 11. 7. 13., that it seems impossible to believe the measure adopted by Socrates could have been other than the Choliambic.

The words of Xenophon are these :

Καὶ ὁ Σωκράτης ἔφη, Εἴτα οὐ λέγεις τὸν τοῦ κυνὸς λόγον; Φασὶ γὰρ ὅτε φωνηέντα ἦν τὰ ζῶα, τὸν Οἶν πρὸς τὸν δεσπότην εἰπεῖν, θαυμαστὸν ποιεῖς, ὅς ἡμῖν μὲν ταῖς καὶ ἑρία σοι καὶ ἄρνας καὶ τύρον παρεχούσαις οὐδὲν δίδως, ὅ, τι ἂν μὴ ἐκ τῆς γῆς λάβωμεν· τῷ δὲ κυνὶ, ὅς οὐδὲν τοιοῦτόν σοι παρέχει, μεταδιδῶς, οὐπὲρ αὐτὸς ἔχεις σίτου· τὸν Κύναν οὖν ἀκούσαντα εἰπεῖν, ναὶ μὰ Δία, ἐγὼ γάρ εἰμι ὁ καὶ ὑμᾶς αὐτὰς σῶζων, ὥστε μῆτε ὑπ' ἀνθρώπων κλέπτεσθαι, μῆτε ὑπὸ λύκων ἀρπάζεσθαι· ἐπεὶ ὑμεῖς γε, εἰ μὴ ἐγὼ προφυλάττοιμι ὑμᾶς, οὐδ' ἂν νέμεσθαι δύναισθε, φοβούμεναι μὴ ἀπόλησθε.

By comparing the language of these two writers, the fable, as spoken by Socrates, may thus be elicited :

ὅτ' ἦν τὰ φωνηέντ' ἐν ἀνδράσιν ζῶα,
τότ' εἶπε ταῦτα πρὸς τὸν οἰόπολον Οἶς τις·
“Κεῖρεις μὲν ἡμᾶς, καὶ πόκους ἔχεις κέρσας·
τὸ γάλα δ' ἀμέλγων, εἴ τι σῶν φιλεῖς, πήξεις·
ἡμῶν δὲ τέκνα μῆλά σοι περισσεύσει,
πλεῖν δ' οὐδὲν ἡμῖν ἄλλο γ' ἢ ὅν τροφαῖς, οἷσπη
ᾧσιν ἐν ὄρεσιν εὐθαλῇ γ' ἐγέννησε,
ὠραῖα βοτάνη καὶ δρόσου γεμισθεῖσα·
φέρβεις δ' ἂν ἡμῖν ἐν μέσοισι κύνα ταύτην,
τρέφων, ὅποια σαυτὸν, εὐθενεῖ σιτῶ.”
τάδ' ὡς ὑπήκουσ' ἡ Κύων, ἔφη ταῦτα·
“Εἰ μὴ παρείην κἂν μέσοις πολευοίμην,
οὐκ ἂν πάθ' ὑμεῖς ἔσχετ' ἄφθονον ποίην·
ἐγὼ δὲ παντοῦθεν τρέχουσα, κωλύω
δρηστῆρα ληστὴν καὶ λύκον διωκτῆρα”

5

10

15

And these the words of the Vatican MS. Fab. 366. p. 149.

Οἶς καὶ Κύων.

Οἶς τις εἶπε πρὸς νομέα τοιάδε.
κεῖρεις μὲν ἡμᾶς, καὶ πόκους
ἔχεις κέρσας, γάλα δ' ἀμέλγων
ἔστί σοι φίλον πῆξαι· ἡμῶν δὲ
τέκνα μῆλά σοι περισσεύσει· πλεόν
δ' οὐδὲν ἡμῖν· ἀλλὰ καὶ τροφὴ γῆς
πᾶσα ἐν ὄρεσιν εὐθαλές τι γεννᾷ
σοι, ὠραῖα βοτάνη καὶ δρόσου γε-
μισθεῖσα· φέρβεις δ' ἂν ἡμῖν ἐν
μέσοις, κύνα ταύτην τρέφων ὅποια
σαυτὸν εὐθαλεῖ σιτῶ. ταῦθ' ὡς
ἤκουσεν ἡ Κύων, ἔφη τοῖα· εἰ μὴ
παρήμην κἂν μέσοις ἐπολεούμην,
οὐκ ἂν ποθ' ὑμεῖς ἔσχετε ἄφθονον
πόην· περὶτρέχουσα δ' ἐγὼ παντοῦ-
θεν κωλύω δρηστῆρα ληστὴν, καὶ
λύκον διωκτῆρα.

ANNOTATIONES.

1. ἐν ἀνδράσιν ipse inserui, memor similis dictionis in Aristoph. Vesp. 1185. μῦς καὶ γαλῆν μέλλεις λέγειν ἐν ἀνδράσιν.

2. Vocis οἰόπολον e gl. sunt δεσπότην et νομέα.

4. Εἰ ἐστί σοι φίλον πῆξαι erui εἴ τι σῶν φιλεῖς, πήξεις. De voce

σῶν *salvum* vid. Philemon. Lex. v. Σῶος, et Eustath. Ιλ. N. p. 940.

6. πλεῖν est Attice pro πλέον. vid. Brunck. in Aristoph. Indice.

Ibid. Εξ ἀλλὰ καὶ τροφὴ γῆς πᾶσα ἐν ὄρεσιν εὐθαλὲς τι γεννᾷ σοι, ἐρὺ ἀλλό γ' ἢ 'ν τροφαῖς οἴσπη ὅσῃ ἐν ὄρεσιν εὐθαλῇ γ' ἐγέννησε.

Vox inter rariores οἴσπη Amati oculos fefellit, indistincte scripta.

Ἡεzych. Οἴσπαι προβατον καπρος: ubi Alberti vult προβάτων κόπρος: partim bene; respicitur enim ad Herodot. iv. 187. οἴσπη προβάτων. Hic jungo ὅσῃ cum βοτάνῃ in versu proximo.

V. 10. Vulgo εὐθαλεῖ. At canis cibo non herba vescitur.

In the preceding fable, the Choliambic measure was first detected by Coray; whose edition if I had seen at an earlier period, I should have avoided an error into which I fell in the Cl. Jl. No. XLIII. p. 216., in accusing Dr. Blomfield of being a plagiarist on Schneider; nor would Dr. B. have been much benefited by the error in the indictment, which assigned the ownership of the metrical restitutions to the wrong proprietor.

In twelve other fables of the Vatican MS., the same Choliambic metre has been detected by Coray; the whole merit of whose discovery Dr. B. took to himself; but beyond which, if he could have gone, when deserted by his guide, he might have still found vestiges of the same Babrian measure in ten other fables of the same MS.

There remain, then, in the whole of the Vatican collection only ten fables not reduced at present, nor to be reduced hereafter, to a metrical form; unless a MS. shall be discovered containing similar fables, but in a dissimilar language, and one nearer allied to Choliambics. That such an event is within the range of probability, is proved by a similar event in the case of the Bodleian MS. No. 2906, in which Tyrwhitt not only discovered fables till then unknown, though since found in the Florentine MS., but also new readings little removed from a metrical form, no vestiges of which were to be seen in similar fables previously published.

In the present and following Number will be given all the fables, in which Babrian Choliambics have been discovered by Tyrwhitt, Coray, and myself, in the Bodleian and Vatican MSS.; and in the subsequent Numbers will be given those which I have elicited from the Florentine and Augsburg MSS., together with those, which exist in Hudson's edition, from whatever source they may be derived.

In thus composing the *disjecta membra poetæ*, I think it necessary to premise that, where the same fable is found in different collections, I have selected from each the phrases most proper for my purpose.

A similar attempt has been partially made by Berger in his "Babrii Fabul. Choliambic." printed at "Monachi, 1816." but with little or no success; as, according to Berger's notions, the law of versification in Choliambics admits a tribrach, anapæst, and dactyl, in any but the 5th and 6th places, and hiatus in abundance. Whereas, in fact, the anapæst is not found except in the first, nor dactyl beyond the third, foot, and the hiatus nowhere.

ÆSOPI Fabulæ, quas Babrias, nescio quis, in Choliambos olim composuisse perhibetur, nunc demum metris suis restitutæ sunt.

Fabulæ excerptæ e Codice Bodleiano.

Bodl. 5. Tyrwh. p. 5=162. ed. De-Fur. et MS. Paris. teste Rochefortio, in *Notice des MSS. de la Bibliothèque du Roi*, T. II. p. 701.

Δρύες καὶ Ζεὺς.

τὸν Ζῆν' ἐπητιωμέναι λέγουσ' αἱ Δρύς,
 "Τί κοπτόμεσθ'; οὐ φαῦλα δενδρέων ἐσμέν."
 'Ἔστ', ἢ δ' ὅς, αὐταὶ γ' αἵτιοι κοπῆς ὑμεῖς·
 εἰ μὴ γὰρ ὑμεῖς τὰ στελίδι' ἐγεννᾶτε,
 οὐκ ἂν γεωργὸς πέλεκυν οὐδαμῶς εἶχεν.

2. Cf. Callimacheum 'Εγὼ δὲ πάντων φαῦλον δενδρέων εἰμί.

3. ἢ δ' ὅς est Platonis ad morem. Mox αὐταὶ αἵτιοι ὑμεῖς ἐόντες ferri possunt cum Homericō Ὀδ. Α. 32, 3.

4, 5. Distichon in Suid. V. Στειλεῖς latitans eruit Tyrwh. Ibi legitur στελεὰ πάντα τίκτητε. Verum εἰ μὴ cum subjunctivo jungi nequeunt; neque intelligi potest πάντα. Optime Bodl. τὰ στελίδια ἐγεννᾶτε.

5. Suid. ἐν δόμοις Id minime intelligo.

Bodl. 21. Tyrwh. p. 6=163. Vid. ad Vatican. 350.

Bodl. 47. Vid. ad Vatican. 376.

Bodl. 74. Tyrwh. p. 8=164. Vid. ad Vatican. 356.

Bodl. 85. Tyrwh. p. 13=167.

Λύκοι καὶ Κύνες.

Λύκοις Κυσὶν τε πόλεμος ἦν ποτ' [ἄσπονδος]
 οἱ σφᾶς ἐκόσμου καὶ διεῖλον εἰς φρήτρας,
 λόχους τε καὶ φάλαγγας, ὥσπερ ἄνθρωποι·
 τοῖς Κυσὶ μὲν Ἕλλην ἡρέθη στρατηγῆσαν
 Κύνων δὲ εἰς τὴν ξυμβολὴν ἐμέλλησεν
 οἱ δ' αὖ Λύκοι [τῷ Κυνὶ γε] δεῖν ἐπηπείλουν.

ὁ δ' εἶπεν, “ Ἰστε, διὰ τινός γε χεῖρ' ἴσχω
 χρὴ τὸν στρατηγὸν εἰσαεῖ προβουλεύειν
 ὑμῶν τὸ γένος ἔν ἐστι, μία χροά πάντων
 πολλῶν τρόπων ἔστ', οὐδ' ἴσον τὸ πᾶν αὐχεῖ. 10
 ἀλλ' οἱ μὲν ἡμῶν μέλανες, οἱ δὲ τεφρώδεις·
 ἄλλοι δὲ πυρροὶ, καὶ διάργεμοι στήθη·
 πῶς δ' ἂν δυναίμην τῶν κυνῶν ἀσυμφώνων
 εἰς πόλεμον ἀρχεῖν, πᾶν δ' ὅμοιον αὐχούτων;”

1. Ipse inserui ἄσπονδος. De locutione πόλεμος ἄσπονδος vid. Schæfer. ad Dionys. de Compos. p. 38. et Lobeck. ad Ajac. 801. Cf. et Æsop. Fab. 242. ἄσπονδον εἶχον μάχην.

2, 3. Tyrwh. citat Suid. Φρήτρα.

7. Cf. Soph. Aj. 50. ἐπεσχεν χεῖρα διψῶσαν φόνου. Athen. p. 433. F. ἴσχειν—χεῖρα.

12. Suid. Διάργεμοι, quem citat Tyrwh., exhibet ἕτεροι δὲ ξανθοί: at Bodl. οἱ δὲ πυρροί. Dedi ἄλλοι δὲ πυρροί.

Bodl. 93. Tyrwh. p. 14=168. In Florem. est Fab. 121.

Μῦς ἀρουραῖος καὶ Μῦς ὁ ἐν οἴκῳ.

φιλίαν ἔθεντο μῦς δὺ, ὁ μὲν ἀρουραῖος,
 ὁ δ' οἰκόσιτος, ὥστ' ἔχειν βίον κοινόν·
 οὗτος δὲ κληθεὶς πρῶτος ἦλθε δειπνήσων
 ἐπὶ τὴν ἀρουραίου γ', ἔτους ἀπανθούντος·
 τρώγων δ' ὀρύζας σῖτα τ' ἔνδετ' ἐν βώλοισ, 5
 “ Μύρμηκος,” εἶπε, “ ζῆς βίον ταιλαιπύρου·
 ἐμοὶ δὲ πόλλ' ἄρ' ἐστὶν ἄγαθ'· Ἀμαλθεῖας
 οἴκοι τὸ κέρας, ὡς πρὸς σέ γ', εὐχόμεσθ' εἶναι·
 μετ' ἐμοῦ δ' ἂν ἔλθῃς, ὡς θέλεις, ἀσωτεύσεις.”
 πείσας δ' ἐς οἶκον μῦν ἀπῆγ' ἀρουραῖον. 10
 ἔδειξε δ' οὐ τὰ σῖτ' ἄλευρα, καὶ ῥίζας,
 οὐ δ' ὀσπρίων ἦν σῶρος ἢ πίθος συκῶν,
 στάμνοι τε μέλιτος, σῶρακοί τε φοινίκων·
 αὐτος δὲ τερφθεὶς καὶ σφοδρ' αὐτὸν ἐξήλου,
 τύχην δ' ἑαυτοῦ πόλλ' ἐμέμφεθ'· ὁ δὲ τυρόν 15
 [Σικελικὸν] ἤγαγ' ἐκ κανισκίου σύρων,
 οὐ, διαχυθεὶς γὰρ ἦν, ἐμελλ' ἀπάρασθαι,
 ἤνεξε δ' οἰκῆς τὴν θύραν τις ἐξαίφνης·
 οἱ δ' ἐς στένην τρώγλην ὑπεισεπήδησαν,
 καὶ τοῦ κτύπου τι δείλαιοι φοβηθέντες, 20
 ἤριζον οὐ, στενούμενοί γ' ὑπ' ἀλλήλων·
 μικρὸν δ' ἐπισχῶν, εἴτ' ἔσωθεν ἐκκύψας
 ψαύειν ἐμελλεν ἰσχάδης Καμειραίας,
 ἦλθ' ἕτερος αὖ τις· οἱ δὲ πάλιν ἐκρύπτοντο·
 ὁ δὲ μῦς, ἄδειπνός ὢν, τὰδ' εἶπ' ἀρουραῖος· 25

“ὦ χαῖρ’, αὖτ’ ἔχων τὰδ’ οὐκ ἀκινδύνως
ἐγὼ δὲ λιτῆς οὐκ ἀφέξομαι βώλου,
ὅφ’ ἦν τὰ κρίμνα μὴ φοβούμενος τρώγω.”

4. Bodl. ἐπὶ τῆς ἀρούρας ἔτι ἀνθούσης. Reposui ἐπὶ τὴν ἀρου-
ραίου (scil. οἰκίαν) ἔτους ἀπανθούσης: etenim anni tempus fuit post
messem.

6. Hunc versum eruit Tyrwh.

8. Redde ὡς πρὸς σέ γ’, in comparison with thee.

12, 13. Tyrwh. citat Suid. Σωράκους.

14, 15. Fl. αὐτὸν εὐλόγει σφόδρα καὶ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ κατεμέμεφετο
τύχην. Nihil simile Bodl. exhibet.

16. Siculum caseum commemorat Aristoph.

17. Fl. βουλομένων δὲ ἀπάρξασθαι ἐσθίειν.

18. Fl. ἤνοιξεν εὐθύς ἀνθρωπὸς τις τὴν θύραν.

19. Fl. φοβηθέντες δὲ οἱ δαίμονες τοῦ κτύπου εἰσεπήδησαν.

22, 23. Tyrwh. citat Suid. Καμειραία et mox in 27, 28.

Κρίμνον.

Totam fabulam Latine reddidit Horatius Sermon. 11. 6.

Bodl. 45. Tyrwh. p. 17=170.: p. 55=197.: p. 69=202.
ex Harleiano MS. 3521.

Ἑλπίς.

Ζεὺς ἐν πίθῳ τὰ χρηστὰ κακὰ τε συλλέξας,
ἔθηκεν αὐτὸν πωμάσας παρ’ ἀνθρώπων
ὁ δ’ ἀκρατὴς ἀνθρώπος, εἰδέναι σπεύδων
τί πότ’ ἦν ἐν αὐτῷ, καὶ τὸ πῶμα κινήσας
διῆκ’ ἀπελθεῖν χρηστὰ πρὸς θεῶν οἴκους,
κακὰ τε πετέσθαι τῇδ’, ἐκείσε τ’ αὖ φεύγειν
μόνη δ’ ἔμεινεν Ἑλπίς, ἣν κατείληφε
τεθὲν τὸ πῶμα τοίγαρ Ἑλπίς ἀνθρώποις
μόνη σύνεστι τῶν πεφευγόντων ἡμᾶς
ἀγαθῶν, ἀκέσματ’ ἐγγυωμένη δώσειν.

1. Ex Hesiodo patet in illo dolio inesse tam mala quam bona
conservata. Dedi igitur κακὰ τε hic vice πάντα et in v. 6.
vice κάκει.

6. Vulgo σῆς δὲ γῆς ἄνω. At tautologa sonant πετέσθαι et ἄνω
φεύγειν.

10. Inepte legitur ἀγαθῶν ἕκαστον.

Bodl. 50. Tyrwh. p. 18=170.

Θεῶν γάμοι.

ἔγημαν, ἣν θεῶν ἕκαστος εἴληχεν,
πάντες παρῆν δ’ Ἄρης ἐν ἐσχάτῳ κλήρῳ
Ἵβριν δὲ κατέλαβ’ ἣν μάλ’ ἠγάπησ’· αἶ
τῇδ’ ἐπακολουθεῖ πανταχῇ βαδίζουσα.

4. Hunc versum modo non omnem eruit Tyrwh.

Bodl. 56. Tyrwh. p. 18=171.

Ἴππος καὶ Στρατιώτης.

τὸν Ἴππον εὖ πως Δεσπότης ἐκρίθιζεν,
τέως ὁ πολέμου καιρὸς ἦν, ἔχων σφ' αἰεὶ
σύνεργον ἐν τοῖς ἐσχάτοις γε κινδύνου.

*ὅτε δὲ ὁ πόλεμος κατέπαυσεν εἰς δουλείας τινὰς

*καὶ φόρτους βαρεῖς ὁ Ἴππος ὑπουργεῖ ἀχύρῳ μόνῳ

5

τρεφόμενος. ὥς δὲ πάλιν ὁ πόλεμος ἠκούσθη,

σάλπιγξ τ' ἐφώνησ', αὐθις αὖ χαλινώσας

τὸν Ἴππον ἐπέβη Δεσπότης καθοπλισθείς.

ὁ δὲ συνεχῶς ἔπταισε μηδὲν ἰσχύων,

τῷ δεσποτῇ δ' ἔφη, Σὺ μετὰ γε τῶν πεζῶν

10

ἔρξ' εἰς ὄνον με μετεποιήσας ἀνθ' ἵππου·

καὶ πῶς πάλιν ἔχειν ἐξ ὄνου θέλεις μ' ἵππον;

4, 5. Distichon metricum eruere nequeo.

10, 12. Hoc distichon eruit Tyrwh.

Bodl. 76. Tyrwh. p. 20=171.

Λέων δικάσπολος.

Λέων τις ἐβασίλευεν οὐχὶ θυμῶδης

οὐδ' ὠμὸς ἀλλὰ πρᾶος, ὥσπερ ἄνθρωπος.

ὁ δὲ συναθροίσας πάντα θηρὶ ἠνώγει

δοῦναι δίκας τε καὶ λαβεῖν πρὸς ἀλλήλων,

λύκον προβατίῳ, παρδαλισκὸν αἰγάγρῳ,

5

ἐλάφῳ δὲ τίγριν, καὶ κύνας λαγῶς· ὁ πτῶξ

“Οὐκ ἠύχόμην,” φησ', “ἡμέραν μ' ἰδεῖν ταύτην,

ἐν ᾗ φόβον τό γ' ἀσθενὲς βία φύη.”

1, 2, 4. Hoc tristichon modo non eruit Tyrwh.

8. Cf. Alcæi Fragm. 49. ἐλάφῳ δὲ βρόμον ἐν στήθεσσι φύει.

Bodl. 94. Tyrwh. p. 20=172. Vid. ad Vatican. 363.

Bodl. 97. Tyrwh. p. 20=172. Vid. ad Vatican. 364.

Bodl. 104. Tyrwh. p. 21=172. Vid. ad Vatican. 365.

Hactenus de fabulis, quas e Codice Bodleiano primus evulgavit Tyrwhittus, ipse vero primus in Choliambos disposui; restat ut alias quæque describam, quæ, diu licet evulgatæ sint, in Codice tamen Bodleiano metricam sibi formam modo non omnem indunt, uti primus Tyrwhittus sensit.

Bodl. Fab. 1. Hudson. Fab. 138. Tyrwh. p. 22.=173.

τῷ παιδί μέγα κλάοντι Γραῦς τὰδ' ἠπείλει·

Εἰ μὴ σιωπήσεις, σὲ τῷ Λύκῳ ῥίψω.

ὁ Λύκος, παρῶν γὰρ ἔτυχε, τὴν τροφὴν ζητῶν,

τὰδ' ἔκλυε· τὴν Γραῦν δ' οἰόμενος ἀληθεύειν,

ἐκατέρησε, μέχρ' ἰσπέρας κεινῶν·

πάλιν δ' ἀνελθόνθ' ἡ σύνοικος ἡρώτα,
 Πῶς οὐδὲν ἄρας ὦδ' ἀνῆλθες ὡς αἰί;
 ὁ δ' εἶπε, Πῶς οὐκ; ἦν γυναικὶ πιστεύσας.

5. Blomfieldus hunc versum diu post Tyrwhittum eruit e Fab. 1. quam e MS. Parisiensi edidit Rochefort. in *Notice des MSS. de la Bibliothèque du Roi*, T. II. p. 687.

Bodl. 46. Tyrwh. p. 22=173, Hudson. 140.

Ἡμίονος ἔτρεχεν ἐκ φάτνης παχυνηῖσα·
 σκιρτῶσα δ' ἔλεγεν, “Ἴππος ἐστί μοι μήτηρ.
 ἐγὼ γὰρ αὐτῆς εἰμὶ καὶ δρόμῳ κρείσσων.”
 παυσθεῖς δ', ὅτ' ἥσθμαινεν, μάλ' ἐσκυθρῶπαζεν.
 οἶνον γὰρ εὐθὺς πατρὸς οὐδ' ἀνεμνήσθη.

1, 2, 5. Hos tres versus eruit Tyrwh.

Bodl. 58. Tyrwh. p. 23=174. Hudson 188. ubi citatur Aphthonii Fab. 31. necnon Liban. Fab. 3. et Tzetz. Chiliad. VIII. 205.

Κολοῖος καὶ Γλαυξ.

δι' αἰθέρ' ἦν πτηνοῖσι πᾶσι κήρυγμα,
 “τὸν Ζῆνα μέλλειν βασιλεῖ ὀρνέοις στῆσειν,
 ὅστις ποτ' εἰς τὸ κάλλος ἂν φανῇ κρείσσων.”
 πάντες δ' ἐφοίτων ἡμέραν θ' ὀρίζοντος
 ἐκκλησίαν τε κυρίαν τέκνου Μαιᾶς
 εἰς τὴν Στύγ' [Ἀρκάδ'] ἐπισυνηγμένοι λίμνην·
 κατελάμβανον δὲ πᾶσαν, ἵνα τὰ μὲν φαῦλα
 πτέρ' ἀπέβαλον, τὰ δ' αὖ καλ' ἐξεφαίδρυναν·
 ἀλλ' οὐδὲν εὐπρεπὲς Κολοῖος εἶχ', υἱὸς
 γέρων κορώνης· πτερὰ δ', ὅσ' ἐξέπιπτ' ἄλλων,
 συνέθηκε· ταῦτα, κοσμὸν ὥς τιν' οἰκεῖον,
 ταῦ γε χρῆμα ποικιλώτερον πολλῶ·
 οὐ δ' εἰσίωντος, ὄμματ' ἐστράφη πάντων,
 χῶ Ζεὺς τὸ κάλλος εἰσιδὼν ἐθαμβήθη,
 λευκὸν κύκνου καὶ σεμνὸν ἄετοῦ μάλλον.
 πρὶν δ' αὐτὸν εἰπεῖν, “βασιλεῖ ὀρνέοις στῆναι
 ἔδοξε πλεῖστα τὸν Κολοῖον ὠραῖον,”
 ἦ Γλαυξ, Ἀθηναία τις, αὐτὸν ἤλεγχεν,
 κάφειλετ' ἐκσπᾶσασα τὰ πτέρ' οἰκέα,
 καὶ ταυτό γ' ἄλλων ὀρνέων ποιησάντων,
 γυμνὸς ὁ Κολοῖος ὦν γέλω διεγνώσθη.

Ita fere hanc fabulam ipse olim metris restitutam exhibui in *Cl. Jl.* No. XLIII. p. 217. Hodie vero placet subjungere annotationes tunc temporis prætermittas.

1. Bodl. Ἴρις—πᾶσι πετεινοῖς ἐκήρυξεν.

2. Tzetz. τὸν Δία μέλλοντα ποιεῖν ὀρνέοις βασιλέα.

3. Bodl. εἴ τις ὑμῶν κρείττων εἰς κάλλος φανῇ.

4. Aphthon. πάντες οἱ ὄρνεις ἐφοίτων, Ἐρμοῦ τὴν κυρίαν ὀρίζοντος. Ipse addidi ἡμέραν; cf. Eurip. Orest. 48 et 1053. et Herodot.

vi. 129. Tzetzes quoque ἡμέραν—προειπεῖν.

5. In Hudson. legitur προθεσμίαν—ἔταξεν. Dedi ἐκκλησίαν. Vid. Suid. Ἐκκλησία κυρία.

6. Bodl. ἐπισυνηγμένων δὲ πάντων ὀρνέων εἰς τὴν τῆς Στυγὸς κρήνην. Herodotus vi. 74. commemorat τὸ Στυγὸς ὕδωρ in Arcadia. Inserui igitur Ἀρκάδι.

7. Aphthon. λίμνας δὲ κατελάμβανον τὰ μὲν φαῦλα τῶν πτερῶν ἀποβάλλοντες, τὰ δὲ κρείττω φαιδρύνοντες.

9. Aphthon. κολοῖδς δὲ οὐδὲν εὐπρεπὲς ἔχων.

10. Bodl. Κολοῖδς υἱὸς κοράνης γέρων. Mox Aphthon. ἂ τῶν ἄλλων ἐξέπιπτε, ταῦτα οἰκεῖον συνέθηκε κοσμόν.

12. Liban. χρῆμα ποικιλώτερον γίγνεται. Collato igitur Alexid. apud Athen. p. 107. C. ἐποίησά τ' αὐτὸ ποικιλώτερον ταῷ, hic reposui ταῷ: unde emenda et Bodl. πάντων ὀρνέων τὰ πτερὰ πρὸς αὐτὴν ἀρμοσάμενος ἤλυσεν αὐτοῦ κρείσσων, legendo καὶ ταῷ. Fuit ταῷς avis ποικίλη; cf. Philostrat. p. 856. στικτὸς ὡς ταῷς. Mox Liban. μικρὸν δὲ τὸν ταῷς ἐδόκει. De χρῆμα in tali re vid. Valck. ad Phoen. 206.

13. Liban. καὶ ὡς ἤκεν ἐπὶ τὴν κρίσιν, ἐπέστρεφε μὲν τῶν ὀρνέων τὰ ὄμματα.

14. Bodl. ὁ Ζεὺς δὲ τὸ κάλλος θαμβηθεῖς. Liban. θάμβος δὲ ἐνέβαλλε καὶ αὐτῷ τῷ δικαστῇ.

15. Liban. ὥστε ὑπεχώρει μὲν αὐτῷ καὶ ὁ λευκότατος κύκνος—κατεπεφρόνητο δὲ καὶ αὐτοῦ σεμνότης.

18. Bodl. εἰ μὴ Χελιδὼν Ἀθηναία τοῦτον ἤλεγξε τὸ πτερὸν αὐτοῦ ἐκπάσασα. At Tzet. Καὶ εἰ μὴ Γλαυξ γνωρίσασα πτερὸν τι τῶν οἰκειῶν—ἀφείλετο; et sic Theophylact. Simocat. Epist. ἤλεγξε τὴν ἀμορφίαν ἢ Γλαυξ—τὸ γὰρ οἰκεῖον ἐπιγνοῦσα πτερὸν, ὡς ἴδιον ἀφείλετο.

20. Bodl. τὸ αὐτὸ δὲ καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ὀρνέων ποιησάντων, διεγνώσθη κολοῖδς ὤν.

21. Liban. ἐγυμνοῦτο τοῦ κολοιοῦ τὸ εἶδος καὶ ἐγεῖατο. Sic quoque Horatius *maqueat cornicula risum furtivis nudata coloribus*. Aphthon. ὁ κολοῖδς γυμνός.

Bodl. 80. Hudson 139. Tyrwh. p. 24=174. totam fabulam restituit.

Λύκος καὶ Ἀρνεῖος.

Λύκος παρῇ ἐς τριγχόν, ἔνθεν ἐκκύβας
Ἀρνεῖος αὐτὸν ἔλεγε πολλὰ βλάσφημῶς
κάκεινος εἶπε, τὰς σιαγύνας κρήναι,

“αὐτὸς ὁ τόπος με λαιδορεῖ· σὺ μὴ καυχῶ.”

Bodl. 131. Tyrwh. p. 25=175. Ἀλαπήξ καὶ Πάργδαλις. Vid. ad Florent. 13.

Bodl. 135. Tyrwh. p. 25=175. Flor. 114. August. 161. Hudson 240.

Μέλισσα καὶ Ζεὺς.

Ἵμνηττία Μέλισσα κηρίων μήτηρ,
τὸ μέλι φεροῦσ' ἀνῆλθεν εἰς θεῶν οἴκους
μήπω καπνισθέν· Ζεὺς δὲ προσφορᾷ τερφθεὶς
ὑπέσχεθ', ὃ, τι δέοιτό νιν, γέρας δοῦναι·
ἢ δ' εἶπε, "δός μοι κέντρ', ἵν', εἴ τις ἄνθρωπος" 5
τὸ κηρόπλαστον ἔργον ἐγγίσει· ἄραι
θέλων, φονεύσω τόνδε·" μάλα δ' ἀπηρέσθη
Ζεὺς τῇ δεήσει· πλεῖστα γὰρ φιλεῖ θνητούς·
ἄκων δ' ὅμως ἔδωκεν· εἶπε γὰρ δώσειν·
καὶ τῇ Μελίσση φησὶν, "ταῦθ', ὅς' ᾔτησας, 10
γενήσεται σοί γ'· ἀλλ', ὅταν τινὰ σμῆνος
τὸ μέλι λαβόντα πλησίον γε πᾶν χρώσῃ,
τὸ κέντρον ἐκβαλεῖ σὺ, χάμα τὴν ψυχὴν.

1, 9. Hos duo versus modo non eruit Tyrwh.

3. Fl. προσφορᾷ servavit; alii δώρω.

12. Vice προσκρούσης dedi πᾶν χρώσης: verbum est χροίζω vel χρωΐζω, cutem alicujus tango.

G. B.·

THE ARITHMETIC OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

AT a period, when the distribution of the Sacred Volume is unexampled, and the public attention is so generally directed towards it, it is natural that every department of knowledge which the Scripture communicates should become the subject of investigation. The Bible is often called the plainest book, yet it is certainly the most learned; and even apart from its incomparably moral and religious sentiments, it has treasures and beauties in literature of the very highest order. Its literary and scientific character remains yet to be appreciated, as its matchless worth undoubtedly demands.

The subject of Biblical Arithmetic, it is conceived, has by no

means had its due share of consideration; and as the very character of Divine Revelation is frequently involved in it, its elucidation must be regarded as of some importance. Several years ago, there were two valuable extracts from Hewlett's Bible, on *Hebrew Numerals*, inserted in the *Clas. Jour.* (see Vols. IV. p. 401—405. and VI. p. 186—190.); but I have looked in vain for the discussion of this subject in any of the subsequent numbers of that periodical. It is my happiness to possess the Journal from its commencement (in 1810) to the present time:—a work which I consider as an invaluable treasury of philological and biblical criticism:—and the communication I now venture to make, is in the hope of seeing some of the pages of its future numbers enriched with the disquisitions of its able contributors, on a topic of no trifling consequence. The result of my own attention to the subject I respectfully submit, trusting that it will be received with candor, as its insertion is requested for the purpose of eliciting rather than of imparting information.

The science or art of Enumeration embraces the notice of numbers, measures, weights, and money; and must now be considered as found in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. But prior to any suggestions on these particulars, a few observations must be offered, and therefore the present article will close with a mere introduction of the subject.

It is probable, that mankind subsisted for a considerable time before they cultivated this science in any material degree, or practised the art of computation on a regular and systematic scale; but to a certain extent it must have been nearly coeval with the existence of human society. The Mosaic history marks the enumeration of time from the commencement of the world; nor could the succession of day and night be observed, without suggesting the idea of calculation. The records of the Antediluvian age, though presenting a mere fragment of history, furnish many intimations of the progress of Arithmetic: the ark of Noah was evidently constructed on mathematical principles.

But however early might be its origin, its progress must have depended on the advancement of commerce, because arithmetical calculations becoming then more necessary, the art would receive a greater degree of attention. Hence, Arithmetic is supposed to have been of Phœnician or Hebrew invention; and according to Josephus, the Egyptians first received the knowledge of it from Abraham:—*την αριθμητικὴν αὐτοῖς χαρίζεται, καὶ τὰ περὶ ἀστρονομίαν παραδίδωσι· προ γὰρ τῆς Ἀβραμῆ παρουσίας εἰς Αἴγυπτον, οἱ Αἰγυπτιοὶ εἰχόν ἀμαθῶς· ἐκ Χαλδαίων γὰρ ταῦτα ἐπεφοίτησεν εἰς*

Αιγυπτον, οθεν ανηλθεν και εις τους Ελληνας: Lib. cap. 8.; cited in Gale's Court of Gent. II. pp. 10, 11.—From Asia, it is said to have passed into Egypt; from Egypt, arithmetic was transmitted to the Greeks; thence, with its improvements, it proceeded to the Romans, and from them it has been dispersed over the modern nations of the world.

The first employment of figures is usually attributed to the Arabians; but the Arabian writers acknowledge that they originally derived their notation from the Indians. To the Mohammedan conquerors or Moors of Spain, Europe stands indebted for the knowledge of the decimal scale. In India, however, and not in Arabia, the digits, erroneously called the Arabic digits, were invented. (See Mill's Hist. of Muham. p. 391. 2nd Ed.) The Jews were immediately indebted to the Arabians for their figures; and these, together with their vowel points and other additions to their language, they are supposed to have received about the 10th century. It is worthy of remark, that the first of their grammarians was Rabbi Judas, תידין, an Arabian, who lived at this period, and who is often noticed by Aben Esra and D. Kimchi as the ראש המדקקים.—Buxtorf. Rabb. Bibl. p. 384.

The introduction of figures into the Hebrew Scriptures is ascribed to Rabbi Mordecai Nathan, a celebrated Jewish teacher in the 15th century; and the divisions to which he applied them, constitute the present verses of the Old Testament. In imitation of his improvement (for Nathan merely improved the plan of H. de S. Caro, of the 13th century, by substituting for the alphabetical letters smaller divisions, and distinguishing them by numerical figures), Robert Stephens introduced the verses and figures into the New Testament, in the year 1551.

As to the character or import of these figures; whether they are merely arbitrary signs, or whether they are parts of letters or words, or any significant and expressive marks, it is perhaps impossible to decide. Some ingenious attempts have lately been made (Suppl. of Encyc. Brit.) to prove, that they are the result of different combinations of simple strokes. But, say other Oriental writers, it appears that the original numerals of the Hindûs (of which the Arabic or Indian digits are only an abridgment) may be considered as primitive words; evidently letters, and not the combination of simple strokes. *Wilkins's Sanscrit Gram.* p. 521.—The interesting results of extended acquaintance with the treasures of the East will most probably furnish additional information on this and every other particular of general literature.

32 *The Arithmetic of the Holy Scriptures.*

A Jewish method of computation deserves notice, though not immediately connected with the Holy Scriptures. They frequently omit the numeral letter for thousand, for the sake of brevity; and this mode of computing they call *לפ"ק*, that is, *לפרט קשר* according to the smaller reckoning. They compute their time from the Creation: but there is a difference of 240 years between their time and ours; and therefore so many years must always be added. For example, the Grammar of the learned Kimchi was printed at Venice, by Bomberg, in the year *שה לפ"ק* (305 according to the small reckoning), that is, of the world 5305, according to the Rabbinical year, but 1545 of the Christian æra; for $1000 + 240 + 305 = 1545$.

The dates of Hebrew books, printed in former times, and on the Continent, are generally placed at the bottom of the title-page, where we notice a line in which certain letters are of a larger size. In order to understand them arithmetically, the larger letters must be numerated, and their number added together will give the year in which the book was printed. As *בשנת לשע עמך ישע את משיחך*: the sum of whose large letters ($\aleph 1 + \daleth 40 + \shin 300 + \yod 10 + \kaph 8 + \daleth 20 = 379$) shows that the date is 379 of the Jewish year; and 1619 A. D.

At the end of every book of the Hebrew Scriptures, the Masorites have enumerated the several portions, and noted them down by numeral letters. At the close of Genesis, for instance, they express the number of verses by *ל"ד ל"ג*, which denote 1534; for \aleph is equal to 1000

$$\left. \begin{array}{rcl} \daleth & - & 500 \\ \shin & - & 30 \\ \daleth & - & 4 \end{array} \right\} 1534.$$

J. W.

Oswestry, January, 1822.

AN INQUIRY into the Symbolical Language of Ancient Art and Mythology.

BY R. P. KNIGHT.

PART V.—[Continued from No. XLVIII. p. 229.]

109. In the Bacchæ of Euripides, the chorus invoke their inspiring god to appear under the form of a bull, a many-headed serpent, or a flaming lion;¹ and we sometimes find the lion among the accessory symbols of Bacchus; though it is most commonly the emblem of Hercules or Apollo; it being the natural representative of the destroying attribute. Hence it is found upon the sepulchral monuments of almost all nations both of Europe and Asia; even in the coldest regions, at a vast distance from the countries in which the animal is capable of existing in its wild state.² Not only the tombs, but likewise the other sacred edifices and utensils of the Greeks, Romans, Chinese and Tartars, are adorned with it; and in Tibet there is no religious structure without a lion's head at every angle having bells pendent from the lower jaw, though there is no contiguous country that can supply the living model.³

110. Sometimes the lion is represented killing some other symbolical animal such as the bull, the horse, or the deer; and these compositions occur not only upon the coins and other sacred monuments of the Greeks and Phœnicians;⁴ but upon those of the Persians,⁵ and the Tartar tribes of Upper Asia;⁶

¹ Φάνηθι, ταυρος, η πολυκρανος γ' ιδειν
δρακων, η πυριφλεγων
ορασθαι λεων.

V. 1015.

κριας, ταυρεους, χαρακουτε λεοντος
(κεφαλαις φερει ο φανης Ορφικος).

Procl. apud Eschenb. Epig. p. 77.

² Hist. gén. des Voyages, t. v. p. 458. Embassy to Tibet, p. 262. Houel Voyage en Sicile.

³ Embassy to Tibet. p. 288.

⁴ See the coins of Acanthus and Velia; and also those of some unknown city of Phœnicia. Houel Voyage en Sicile, pl. xxxv. and vi.

⁵ Ruins of Persepolis by Le Bruyn.

⁶ On old brass coins in the cabinet of Mr. Payne Knight. On a small silver coin of Acanthus in the same cabinet, where there was not room for the lion on the back of the bull, as in the larger, the bull has the face of a lion.

34 *An Inquiry into the Symbolical Language*

in all which they express different modifications of the ancient mystic dogma above mentioned concerning the adverse efforts of the two great attributes of procreation and destruction.

111. The horse was sacred to Neptune and the Rivers;¹ and employed as a general symbol of the waters, on account of a supposed affinity, which we do not find that modern naturalists have observed.² Hence came the composition, so frequent on the Carthaginian coins, of the horse with the asterisk of the Sun, or the winged disc and hooded snakes, over his back;³ and also the use made of him as an emblematical device on the medals of many Greek cities.⁴ In some instances the body of the animal terminates in plumes;⁵ and in others has only wings, so as to form the Pegasus, fabled by the later Greek poets to have been ridden by Bellerophon, but only known to the ancient theologians as the bearer of Aurora and of the thunder and lightning to Jupiter;⁶ an allegory of which the meaning is obvious. The Centaur appears to have been the same symbol partly humanised; whence the fable of these fictitious beings having been begotten on a cloud appears to be an allegory of the same kind.⁷ In the ancient bronze engraved in plate lxxv. of volume i. of the Select Specimens, a figure of one is represented bearing the Cornucopiæ between Hercules and Æsculapius, the powers of destruction and preservation; so that it here manifestly represents the generative or productive attribute. A symbolical figure similar to that of the Centaur occurs among the hieroglyphical sculptures of the magnificent temple of Isis at Tentyris in Ægypt;⁸ and also one of the Pegasus or the winged horse:⁹ nor does the winged bull, the cherub of the Hebrews, appear to be any other than an Ægyptian symbol, of

¹ Virgil Georg. i. 12. and iii. 122. Iliad. φ. 132.

² Φιλολουντρον ζωνον, δ' ἵππος, και φιλυδρον, και χαιρει λειμωσι και ἐλεσι. Aristot. apud Eustath. in Hom. p. 658. l. 59.

³ See Mus. Hunter. Gesner. &c.; the coins being extremely common.

⁴ Cyrenè, Syracuse, Maronea, Erythræ in Bœotia, &c. &c.

⁵ As on those of Lambsacus.

⁶ Lycophr. Alexandr. 17.

Ζηνος δ' ἐν δώμασι ναιει

Βροντην τε Στεροπην τε φερων Διι μητιοεντι.

Hesiod. Theogon. v. 285.

The history of Bellerophon is fully related in the Iliad (Z. 155. &c.); but of his riding a flying horse, the old poet knew nothing.

⁷ According to another fable preserved by Nonnus, they were begotten by Jupiter on the Earth, in an unsuccessful attempt upon the chastity of Venus.

Ου Παφης τοςον ηλθον ες ἱμερον, ἧς χαριν ευνης

Κενταυρους εφυτευσα, βαλων σπορον αυλικι γαιης.

Dionysiac. lib. xxii.

⁸ Denon. pl. cxxii. n. 2.

⁹ Ib. pl. cxxxi. n. 3.

which a prototype is preserved in the ruins of Hermontis.¹ The disguised indications, too, of wings and horns on each side of the conic or pyramidal cap of Osiris are evident traces of the animal symbol of the winged bull.²

112. On the very ancient coins found near the banks of the Strymon in Thrace, and falsely attributed to the island of Lesbos, the equine symbol appears entirely humanised, except the feet, which are terminated in the hoofs of a horse: but on others, apparently of the same date and country, the Centaur is represented in the same action; namely, that of embracing a large and comely woman. In a small bronze of very ancient sculpture, the same priapic personage appears, differing a little in his composition; he having the tail and ears, as well as the feet of a horse, joined to a human body, together with a goat's beard;³ and in the Dionysiacs of Nonnus we find such figures described under the title of Satyrs; which all other writers speak of as a mixture of the goat and man. These, he says, were of the race of the Centaurs; with whom they made a part of the retinue of Bacchus in his Indian expedition;⁴ and they were probably the original Satyrs derived from Saturn, who is fabled to have appeared under the form of a horse in his addresses to Philyra the daughter of the Ocean;⁵ and who, having been the chief deity of the Carthaginians, is probably the personage represented by that animal on their coins.⁶ That these equine Satyrs should have been introduced among the attendants of Bacchus, either in poetry or sculpture, is perfectly natural; as they were personifications of the generative or productive attribute equally with the *Πανισχοι*, of those of a caprine form; wherefore we find three of them on the handle of the very ancient Dionysiac patera ter-

¹ Denon. pl. cxvix. n. 2.

² See pl. ii. vol. i. of the Select Specimens.

³ Inaccurately published in the *Recherches sur les Arts de la Grèce*. pl. xiii. vol. i.; M. D'Hancarville having been misled by his system into a supposition that the animal parts are those of a bull. The figure is now in the cabinet of Mr. Knight.

⁴ Lib. xiii. and xiv.

⁵ *Talis et ipse jubam cervice effundit equina*

• *Conjugis adventu pernix Saturnus, et altum
Pelion hinnitus fugiens implevit acuto.*

Virg. Georg. iii. 92.

⁶ These are probably the personages represented on the Thracian or Macedonian coins above cited; but the Saturn of both seems to have answered rather to the Neptune of the Greeks, than to the personification of Time, commonly called ΚΡΟΝΟΣ or Saturn. The figure represented mounted upon a winged horse terminating in a fish, and riding upon the waters, with a bow in his hand, is probably the same personage. See *Méd. Phén. de Dutens* pl. i. f. 1. The coin is better preserved in the cabinet of Mr. Knight.

36 *An Inquiry into the Symbolical Language*

minating in his symbol of the Minotaur in the cabinet of Mr. Payne Knight. In the sculptures, however, they are invariably without horns; whereas Nonnus calls them *κεροεντες* and *ευχεραις*: but the authority of this turgid and bombastic compiler of fables and allegories is not great. The Saturn of the Romans, and probably of the Phoenicians, seems to have been the personification of an attribute totally different from that of the *Κρονος* of the Greeks, and to have derived his Latin name from Sator, the sower or planter; which accords with the character of Pan, Silenus, or Sylvanus, with which that of Neptune, or humidity, is combined. Hence, on the coins of Naxos in Sicily, we find the figure usually called Silenus with the tail and ears of a horse, sometimes priapic, and sometimes with the priapic term of the Pelasgian Mercury as an adjunct, and always with the head of Bacchus on the reverse. Hence the equine and caprine Satyrs, Fauns, and *Πανισκοι*, seem to have had nearly the same meaning, and to have respectively differed in different stages and styles of allegorical composition only by having more or less of the animal symbol mixed with the human forms, as the taurine figures of Bacchus and the Rivers have more or less of the original bull. Where the legs and horns of the goat are retained, they are usually called Satyrs; and where only the ears and tail, Fauns; and, as this distinction appears to have been observed by the best Latin writers, we see no reason to depart from it, or to suppose, with some modern antiquaries, that Lucretius and Horace did not apply properly the terms of their own language to the symbols of their own religion.¹ The baldness always imputed to Silenus is perhaps best explained by the quotation in the margin.²

113. In the Orphic hymns we find a goddess *Ἰππα* celebrated as the nurse of the generator Bacchus, and the soul of the world;³ and, in a cave of Phigalè in Arcadia, the daughter of Ceres by Neptune was represented with the head of a horse, having ser-

¹ Bassirilievi di Roma, vol. ii. p. 149, not. 14.

² 'Οκοσοι φαλακροι γινονται, οἱ τοι δὲ φλεγματοῦδες εἰσι· καὶ ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ αὐτῶν ἅμα τῇ λαγνείᾳ κλονεόμενον καὶ θερμαινόμενον τὸ φlegμα, προσπίπτον πρὸς τὴν ἐπιδερμίδα καὶ ἐν τῶν τὰς ριζὰς, καὶ ἐκρεοῦσιν αἱ τριχες. Οἱ δὲ εὐνουχοὶ διὰ τοῦτο οὐ γίνονται φαλακροὶ, ὅτι σφῶν οὐ γίνεται κίνησις ἰσχυρὴ κ. τ. λ. Hippocrat. de N. P. s. xviii. xix. φlegμα is not to be understood here, as translated, pituita, phlegm or morbid rheum, but animal viscus or gluten, the material of organisation.³

³ The bald Jupiter, *Zeus φαλακρος*, of the Argives, mentioned by Clemens (Cohort. s. ii.) seems to have signified the same.

³ Hymn. xlviii., and Frægm. No. xliii.

pents and other animals upon it, and holding upon one hand a dolphin, and upon the other a dove;¹ the meaning of which symbols, Pausanias observes, were evident to every learned and intelligent man; though he does not choose to relate it, any more than the name of this goddess;² they being both probably mystic. The title *ἸΠΠΙΟΣ* or *ἸΠΠΙΑ* was applied to several deities;³ and occasionally even to living sovereigns, whom flattery had decked out with divine attributes; as appears in the instance of Arsinoë the wife of Ptolemy Philadelphus, who was honored with it.⁴ One of the most solemn forms of adjuration in use among the ancient inhabitants of Sweden and Norway was by the shoulder of the horse; and when Tyndarus engaged the suitors of Helen to defend and avenge her, he is said to have made them swear upon the testicles of the same animal.⁵

114. In an ancient piece of marble sculpture in relief, Jupiter is represented reposing upon the back of a Centaur, who carries a deer in his hand; by which singular composition is signified, not Jupiter going to hunt, as antiquaries have supposed;⁷ but the all-pervading Spirit, or supreme active principle incumbent upon the waters, and producing fertility; or whatever property or modification of properties the deer was meant to signify. Diana, of whom it was a symbol, was in the original planetary and elementary worship, the Moon; but in the mystic religion, she appears to have been a personification of the all-pervading Spirit, acting through the Moon upon the Earth and the waters. Hence she comprehended almost every other female personification, and has innumerable titles and symbols expressive of

¹ Τεχθῆναι δὲ ὑπο τῆς Δημητρος (ἐκ τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος) οἱ Φιγαλεῖς φασιν οὐκ ἵππον, ἀλλὰ τὴν Δεσπιδίαν ὀνομαζομένην ὑπο Ἀρκαδῶν.—Pausan. Arcad. c. xlii. s. 2.

Το τε σπῆλαιον νομισαὶ τοῦτο ἱερὸν Δημητρος, καὶ ἐς αὐτὸ ἀγαλμα ἀναθεῖναι ξύλου. πεποιθῆσθαι δὲ οὕτω σφισὶ τὸ ἀγαλμα· καθεζεσθῆαι μὲν ἐπὶ πέτρῃ, γυναῖκι δὲ εἰσκεναι τὰ ἀλλὰ πλὴν κεφαλῇν· κεφαλῇν δὲ καὶ κομὴν εἶχεν ἵππου, καὶ δρακοντῶν τε καὶ ἄλλων θηρίων εἰκόνες προσεπέφυκεσαν τῇ κεφαλῇ· χιτῶν δὲ ἐνδεδυτο καὶ ἀκροὺς τοὺς ποδᾶς· δελφίς δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς χειρὸς ἦν αὐτῇ, περισσότερα δὲ ἡ ὄρνις ἐπὶ τῇ ἑτέρᾳ. Pausan. Arcad. c. xlii. s. 3.

² Τῆς δὲ Δεσποινῆς τὸ ὄνομα εἰδείσα ἐς τοῦ ἀτελεστοῦς γραφῶν. Pausan. in Arcad. c. xxxvii. s. 6.

³ Near the Academia in Attica was βωμός Ποσειδῶνος Ἰππίου καὶ Ἀθηνᾶς Ἰππίας. Pausan. in Attic. c. xxx. s. 4.

Ποσειδῶνος Ἰππίου καὶ Ἡρῶς εἰσὶν Ἰππίας βωμοί.—τῇ Ἀρεῶς Ἰππίου, τῇ δὲ Ἀθηνᾶς Ἰππίας βωμός. Pausan. Eliac. l. c. xv. s. 4.

Καὶ Ἀθηνᾶς βωμός ἐστι Ὑγείας τὴνδ' Ἰππίαν Ἀθῆναι ὀνομαζοῦσι, καὶ Διονύσου Μελοπομένου, καὶ Κισσόν τὸν αὐτὸν θεόν. Pausan. in Attic. c. xxxi. s. 3.

⁴ Hesych. in ν. Ἰππία.

⁵ Mallet. Introd. à l'Hist. de Danemarck.

⁶ Pausan. lib. iii. c. xx.

⁷ Winkelman Monument. Antic. ined. No. ii.

38 *An Inquiry into the Symbolical Language*

almost every attribute, whether of creation, preservation, or destruction ; as appears from the Pantheic figures of her ; such as she was worshipped in the celebrated temple of Ephesus, of which many are extant. Among the principal of these symbols is the deer, which also appears among the accessory symbols of Bacchus ; and which is sometimes blended into one figure with the goat, so as to form a composite fictitious animal called a *Tragelephus* ; of which there are several examples now extant.¹ The very ancient colossal statue of the androgynous Apollo near Miletus, of which there is an engraving from an ancient copy in the *Select Specimens*, pl. xii. carried a deer in the right hand, and on a very early gold coin probably of Ephesus a male beardless head is represented with the horns of the same animal ;² whence we suspect that the metamorphose of Actæon, like many other similar fables, arose from some such symbolical composition.

115. It is probable therefore that the lion devouring the horse, represents the diurnal heat of the Sun exhaling the waters ; and devouring the deer, the same heat withering and putrefying the productions of the earth ; both of which, though immediately destructive, are preparatory to reproduction : for the same fervent rays, which scorch and wither, clothe the earth with verdure, and mature all its fruits. As they dry up the waters in one season, so they return them in another, causing fermentation and putrefaction, which make one generation of plants and animals the means of producing another in regular and unceasing progression ; and thus constitute that varied yet uniform harmony in the succession of causes and effects, which is the principle of general order and economy in the operations of nature. The same meaning was signified by a composition more celebrated in poetry, though less frequent in art, of *Hercules* destroying a Centaur ; who is sometimes distinguished, as in the ancient coins above cited, by the pointed goat's beard.

116. This universal harmony is represented, on the frieze of the temple of Apollo Didymæus near Miletus, by the lyre supported by two symbolical figures composed of the mixed forms

¹ *Τραγελαφών προτομαὶ ἐκτυπεῖς* were among the ornaments of the magnificent hearse, in which the body of Alexander the Great was conveyed from Babylon to Alexandria (*Diodor. Sic. l. xxviii. c. 20.*) ; where it was deposited in a shrine or coffin of solid gold ; which having been melted down and carried away during the troubles by which Ptolemy XI. was expelled, a glass one was substituted and exhibited in its place in the time of Strabo. See *Geogr. l. xvii.*

² In the cabinet of Mr. Payne Knight.

and features of the goat and the lion, each of which rests one of its fore feet upon it.¹ The poets expressed the same meaning in their allegorical tales of the loves of Mars and Venus; from which sprang the goddess Harmony,² represented by the lyre;³ which, according to the Egyptians, was strung by Mercury with the sinews of Typhon.⁴

117. The fable of Ceres and Proserpine is the same allegory inverted: for Proserpine or Περσεφονεία, who, as her name indicates, was the goddess of Destruction, is fabled to have sprung from Jupiter and Ceres, the most general personifications of the creative powers. Hence she is called κόρη, the daughter; as being the universal daughter, or general secondary principle; for though properly the goddess of Destruction, she is frequently distinguished by the title ΣΩΤΕΙΡΑ,⁵ Preserver; represented with ears of corn upon her head, as the goddess of Fertility. She was, in reality, the personification of the heat or fire supposed to pervade the earth, which was held to be at once the cause and effect of fertility and destruction, as being at once the cause and effect of fermentation; from which both proceed.⁶ The mystic concealment of her operation was expressed by the black veil or bandage upon her head;⁷ which was sometimes dotted with asterisks; whilst the hair, which it enveloped, was made to imitate flames.⁸

¹ See *Ionian Antiquities* published by the Society of Dilettanti, vol. i. c. iii. pl. ix.

² Εκ δ' Αφροδίτης και Αρεως Ἀρμονίαν γεγενεσθαι μυθολογούνται. Plutarch. de Is. et Osir. p. 370.

— Ἀρεα τε τον μαλερον

ὃς νυν αχαλκος ασπίδων

φλεγει με περιβοητος αρτιαζων. Sophocl. Œd. Tyr. v. 190.

This unarmed Mars is the plague: wherefore that god must have been considered as the Destroyer in general, not as the god of War in particular. — σκοπει δε τον Αρη καθαπερ εν πινακι χαλκῳ την αντικειμενην εκ διαμετρον τῷ Ερῳτι χωραν εχοντα. Plutarch. Amator. p. 757.

³ Ἦν ἄρμοζεται Ζηνος ευειδης Απολλων,

πασαν αρχην και τελος συλλαβων,

εχει δε λαμπρον πληκτρον, ἥλιου φαιος.

Scythin. apud Plutarch. de Pyth. Orac.

⁴ Και τον Ἑρμην μυθολογουσιν, εξελαντα τον Τυφῶνος τῶ νευρα, χαρδαις χρησασθαι διδασκοντες ὡς το παν ὁ λογος διαρμασασμενος, συμφωνον ἐξ ασυμφωνων μερων ἐποιησε, και την φθαρτικῇ οὐκ αὐτῶλεσεν ἀλλ' ἀνεπληρωσε δυναμιν. Plutarch. de Is. et Osir. p. 373.

⁵ See coins of Agathocles, &c.

⁶ Ζωη και θανατος μουνη θνητοις πολυμοχοις

Περσεφονεία φερεϊς γαρ αι, και παντα φονευεις. Orph. Hymn. cxix.

⁷ ——— και τα κελαυα

ομνυμεν αρρητον δῆμνια Φερσεφονης.

Meleagr. Epigr. cxix in Brunck. Anal.

⁸ See silver coins of Syracuse, &c.

40 *An Inquiry into the Symbolical Language*

118. The Nephthè or Nephthus of the Egyptians, and the Libitina, or goddess of Death of the Romans, were the same personage: and yet, with both these peoples, she was the same as Venus and Libera, the goddess of Generation.¹ Isis was also the same, except that, by the later Ægyptians, the personification was still more generalised, so as to comprehend universal nature; whence Apuleius invokes her by the names of Eleusinian Ceres, Celestial Venus, and Proserpine; and she answers him by a general explanation of these titles. "I am," says she, "Nature, the parent of things, the sovereign of the elements, the primary progeny of time, the most exalted of the deities, the first of the heavenly gods and goddesses, the queen of the shades, the uniform countenance; who dispose with my nod the luminous heights of heaven, the salubrious breezes of the sea; and the mournful silence of the dead; whose single deity the whole world venerates in many forms, with various rites, and many names. The Ægyptians skilled in ancient lore worship me with proper ceremonies; and call me by my true name, Queen Isis."²

119. This universal character of the goddess appears, however, to have been subsequent to the Macedonian conquest; when a new modification of the ancient systems of religion and philosophy took place at Alexandria, and spread itself gradually over the world. The statues of this Isis are of a composition and form quite different from those of the ancient Ægyptian goddess; and all that we have seen are of Greek or Roman sculpture. The original Ægyptian figure of Isis is merely the animal symbol of the cow humanised, with the addition of the serpent, disc, or some other accessory emblem: but the Greek and Roman figures of her are infinitely varied, to signify by various symbols the various attributes of universal Nature.³ In this character she is confounded with the personifications of Fortune

¹ Plutarch in Numa.

Νεφθην, ἣν καὶ Τελευτήν καὶ Ἀφροδίτην, ἐνίοι δὲ καὶ Νικην ὀνομαζούσιν.

Plutarch: de Is. et Osir.

Liberam, quàm eandem Proserpinam vocant. Cic. in Verr. A. ii. l. iv. s. xlvii.

² Metam. lib. xi. p. 257. "En adsum, tuis commota, Luci, precibus, rerum natura parens, elementorum omnium domina, sæculorum progenies initialis, summa numinum, regina manium, prima cœlitum, deorum, dearumque, facies uniformis: quæ cœli luminosa culmina, maris salubria flamina, inferorum deplorata silentia nutibus meis dispenso, cujus numen unicum, multiformi specie, ritu vario, nomine multijugo totus veneratur orbis.——Prisca doctrina pollentes Ægyptii, ceremoniis me prorsus propriis percolentes, appellant vero nomine Reginam Iaidem."

³ See plate lxx. of vol. 1. The Ægyptian figures with the horns of the cow, wrought under the Roman empire, are common in all collections of small bronzes.

and Victory, which are in reality no other than those of Providence, and therefore occasionally decked with all the attributes of universal Power.¹ The figures of Victory have frequently the antenna or sail-yard of a ship in one hand, and the chaplet or crown of immortality in the other;² and those of Fortune, the rudder of a ship in one hand, and the cornucopiæ in the other, with the modius or polos on her head;³ which ornaments Bupalus of Chios is said to have first given her in a statue made for the Smyrnæans about the sixtieth Olympiad;⁴ but both have occasionally Isiac and other symbols.⁵

120. The allegorical tales of the loves and misfortunes of Isis and Osiris are an exact counterpart of those of Venus and Adonis;⁶ which signify the alternate exertion of the generative and destructive attributes. Adonis or Adonai was an oriental title of the Sun, signifying Lord; and the boar, supposed to have killed him, was the emblem of Winter;⁷ during which the productive powers of nature being suspended, Venus was said to lament the loss of Adonis until he was again restored to life: whence both the Syrian and Argive women annually mourned his death, and celebrated his renovation;⁸ and the mysteries of Venus and Adonis at Byblus in Syria were held in similar estimation with those of Ceres and Bacchus at Eleusis, and Isis and Osiris in Ægypt.⁹ Adonis was said to pass six months

¹ Ἀπαντα δ' ὅσα νοοῦμεν, ἡγουν πραττομεν,
Τυχῇ ὅστιν, ἡμεῖς δ' ὅσμεν ἐπιγεγραμμενοι.
Τυχῇ κυβερνᾷ παντα· ταυτην καὶ φρενας
Δει, καὶ προνοιαν, τὴν θεον, καλεῖν μνην,
Εἰ μὴ τις ἀλλως ονομασιν χαιρεῖ κενοῖς.

Menandr. in Supp. Fragm. 1.

Εγὼ μὲν οὖν Πινδαρου τα τε ἀλλὰ πειθομαι τῇ φθῇ, καὶ Μοιρων τε εἶναι μίαν τὴν Τυχὴν, καὶ ὑπὲρ τὰς ἀδελφὰς τι ἰσχυεῖν. Pausan. in Achaic. c. xxvi. s. 3.

² See medals, in gold, of Alexander the Great, &c.

³ Bronzi d'Ercolano. tom. ii. tav. xxviii.

⁴ Πρωτος δε, ὡν οἶδα, ἐποίησατο ἐν τοῖς ἐπεσιν Ὅμηρος Τυχῆς μνημὴν· ἐποίησατο δὲ ἐν ὕμνῳ τῷ ἐς τὴν Δημήτρεα. (Vide v. 417. et seq.)—καὶ Τυχὴν ὡς Ὀκεανίου καὶ ταυτὴν παιδα οὖσαν (i. e. Νυμφὴν Ὀκεανιτιδα.)—τῆρα δὲ ἐδηλώσεν οὐδὲν ἐτι, ὡς ἡ θεὸς ἐστὶν αὐτῇ μεγίστη θεῶν ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώπινοις πράγμασι, καὶ ἰσχυὴν παρέχει πλειστην.—Βουβαλος δὲ—Σμυρναῖους ἀγαλμα ἐργάζομενος Τυχὴν πρῶτος ἐποίησεν, ὡν ἰσμεν, πόλον τε ἐχούσαν ἐπὶ τῇ κεφαλῇ, καὶ τῇ ἑτέρᾳ χεὶρὶ τὸ καλούμενον Ἀμαλθείας κέρας ὑπὸ Ἑλλήνων.—ἦσε δὲ καὶ ὕστερον Πινδαρος ἀλλὰ τε ἐς τὴν Τυχὴν, καὶ δὴ καὶ Φερεπόλιν ἀνεκάλεσεν αὐτὴν. Pausan. in Messen. c. xxx. s. 3 et 4. Pindar. in Fragm.

⁵ Bronzi d'Ercolano. tom. ii. tav. xxvi. Medals of Leucadia.

⁶ Οσίριν οὐτα καὶ Ἀδωνιν ὁμοῦ κατὰ μυστικὴν θεοκρασίαν. Suidas in voce διαγνῶμων.

⁷ Hesych. in v. Macrobi. Sat. i. c. xx. τὸν δὲ Ἀδωνιν οὐχ' ἕτερον, ἀλλὰ Διόνυσον εἶναι νομίζουσιν. Plutarch. Sympos. lib. iv. qu. v.

⁸ Lucian. de Dea Syria. Pausan. Corinth. c. xx. s. 6.

⁹ Lucian. ib. s. 6.

42 *An Inquiry into the Symbolical Language*

with Proserpine, and six with Venus; ¹ whence, some learned persons have conjectured that the allegory was invented near the pole, where the sun disappears during so long a time: ² but it may signify merely the decrease and increase of the productive powers of nature as the sun retires and advances. ³ The Vistnoo or Jaggernaut of the Hindoos is equally said to lie in a dormant state during the four rainy months of that climate: ⁴ and the Osiris of the Ægyptians was supposed to be dead or absent forty days in each year, during which the people lamented ⁵ his loss, as the Syrians did that of Adonis, and the Scandinavians that of Frey; ⁶ though at Upsal, the great metropolis of their worship, the sun never continues any one day entirely below the horizon. ⁷ The story of the Phoenix; or, as that fabulous bird was called in the north, of the Fanina, appears to have been an allegory of the same kind, as was also the Phrygian tale concerning Cybele and Attis; though variously distinguished by the fictions of poets and mythographers. ⁸

121. On some of the very ancient Greek coins of Acanthus in Macedonia we find a lion killing a boar; ⁹ and in other monuments a dead boar appears carried in solemn procession; ¹⁰ by both which was probably meant the triumph of Adonis in the destruction of his enemy at the return of spring. A young pig was also the victim offered preparatory to initiation into the Eleusian mysteries, ¹¹ which seems to have been intended to express a similar compliment to the Sun. The Phrygian Attis, like the Syrian Adonis, was fabled to have been killed by a boar; or according to another tradition, by Mars in the shape of that animal; ¹² and his death and resurrection were annually celebrated

¹ Λεγουσι δε περι του Αδωνιδος, οτι και αποθανων, εξ μηνος εποισεν εν αγκαλαις Αφροδιτης, ωσπερ και εν ταις αγκαλαις της Περσεφονης. Schol. in Theocrit. Idyll. 111.

² Ol. Rudbeck. Atlantic. No. ii. c. iii. p. 34. Baillic Hist. de l'Astronomie Ancienne.

³ Φρυγες δε τον θεον οιομενοι χειμωνος καθευδειν, θερους δ' εγρηγορειναι, τοτε μεν κατευνασμαις, τοτε δ' ανεγχεσαι, βακχευοντες αυτω τελουσι. Παφλαγονες δε καταδεισθαι, και κατειγνυσθαι χειμωνος, προς δε κινεισθαι και αναλυεσθαι, φασκουσι. Plutarch. de Is. et Osir.

⁴ Holwell, Part ii. p. 125.

⁵ Ut lacrymante cultrices Veneris sæpe spectantur in sollemnibus Adonidis sacris, quod simulacrum aliquod esse frugum adulterum religiones mysticæ docent. Am. Marcellin. lib. xix. c. 1.

⁶ Theophil. ad Autolyc. lib. i. p. 75.

⁷ Ol. Rudbeck. Atlantic. p. ii. c. v. p. 153.

⁸ Ol. Rudbeck, p. ii. c. iii. et v. Nonni Dionys. M. 396.

⁹ Pelerin. vol. i. pl. xxx. No. 17.

¹⁰ On a marble fragment in relief in the Townley collection.

¹¹ Aristoph. Ειρην 374.

¹² ———— επει σους εικονι μορφης

Αρης καρχαροδων θανατηφορον ιον ιαλλων

Ζηλομανης ημελλεν Αδωνιδι ποτμον οφαινειν. Nonni Dionys.

in the same manner.¹ The beauty of his person, and the style of his dress, caused his statues to be confounded with those of Paris, who appears also to have been canonised; and it is probable that a symbolical composition representing him in the act of fructifying nature, attended by Power and Wisdom, gave rise to the story of the Trojan prince's adjudging the prize of beauty between the three contending goddesses; a story, which appears to have been wholly unknown to the ancient poets, who have celebrated the events of the war supposed to have arisen from it. The fable of Ganymede, the cup-bearer of Jupiter, seems to have arisen from some symbolical composition of the same kind, at first misunderstood, and afterwards misrepresented in poetical fiction: for the lines in the *Iliad* alluding to it, are, as before observed, spurious; and according to Pindar, the most orthodox perhaps of all the poets, Ganymede was not the son of Laomedon, but a mighty genius or deity who regulated or caused the overflowings of the Nile by the motion of his feet.² His being, therefore, the cup-bearer of Jupiter, means no more than that he was the distributor of the waters between heaven and earth, and consequently a distinct personification of that attribute of Jupiter, which is otherwise signified by the epithet *Pluvius*. Hence he is only another modification of the same personification, as *Attis*, *Adonis*, and *Bacchus*; who are all occasionally represented holding the cup or *patera*; which is also given, with the cornucopiæ, to their subordinate emanations, the local genii; of which many small figures in brass are extant.

122. In the poetical tales of the ancient Scandinavians, *Frey*, the deity of the Sun, was fabled to have been killed by a boar; which was therefore annually offered to him at the great feast of *Juul*, celebrated during the winter solstice.³ Boars of paste were also served on their tables during the feast; which, being kept till the following spring, were then beaten to pieces and mixed with the seeds to be sown, and with the food of the cattle and hinds employed in tilling the ground.⁴ Among the *Ægyptians* likewise, those who could not afford to sacrifice real pigs, had images of them in paste served up at the feasts of *Bacchus*

¹ Strabo. lib. x. p. 323. Julian. Orat. v. p. 516.

² Τὸν Γανυμήδην γὰρ αὐτὸν εἶπασαν οἱ περὶ Πινδαρον ἑκατονταργύριον ἀνδριάντα, ἀφ' οὗ τῆς κινήσεως τῶν ποδῶν τὸν Νεῖλον πλημμυρεῖν. Schol. in Arat. Phænomen. v. 282.

³ Ol. Rudbeck. part. i. c. v. viii. and s. part ii. c. v.

⁴ Ibid. and fig. i. p. 229.

44 *An Inquiry into the Symbolical Language*

or Osiris; ¹ which seem, like the feasts of Adonis in Syria, and the Juul in Sweden, to have been expiatory solemnities meant to honor and conciliate the productive power of the Sun by the symbolical destruction of the adverse or inert power. From an ancient fragment preserved by Plutarch, it seems that Mars, considered as the destroyer, was represented by a boar among the Greeks; ² and on coins we find him wearing the boar's, as Hercules wears the lion's skin; ³ in both of which instances the old animal symbol is humanised, as almost all the animal symbols gradually were by the refinement of Grecian art.

123. From this symbolical use of the boar to represent the destroying or rather the anti-generative attribute, probably arose the abhorrence of swine's flesh, which prevailed universally among the Ægyptians and Jews; and partially in other countries, particularly in Pontus; where the temple of Venus at Comana was kept so strictly pure from the pollution of such enemies, that a pig was never admitted into the city.⁴ The Ægyptians are said also to have signified the inert power of Typhon by an ass;⁵ but among the ancient inhabitants of Italy, and probably among the Greeks, this animal appears to have been a symbol of an opposite kind,⁶ and is therefore perpetually found in the retinue of Bacchus: the dismemberment of whom by the Titans, was an allegory of the same kind as the death of Adonis and Attis by the boar, and the dismemberment of Osiris by Typhon:⁷ whence his festivals were in the spring;⁸ and at Athens, as well as in Ægypt, Syria, and Phrygia, the *ΑΦΑΝΙΣΜΟΣ* και *ΕΤΡΕΞΙΣ*, or death and revival, were celebrated, the one with lamentation, and the other with rejoicing.⁹

124. The stories of Prometheus were equally allegorical: for Prometheus was only a title of the Sun expressing provi-

¹ Herodot. ii. 47. Macrob. Sat. i. c. xx. Of the same kind are the small votive boars in brass; of which several have been found: and one of extreme beauty is in the cabinet of Mr. Payne Knight.

² Τυφλος γάρ, ὡ γυναικες, οὐδ' ὄρων Ἀρης

³ Ζυγος προσώπῳ πάντα τυρβαζει κακα. Amator. p. 757.

⁴ See brass coins of Rome, common in all collections.

⁵ Strabo, lib. xii. p. 575.

⁶ Ælian. de Anim. lib. x. c. xxviii.

⁷ Juvenal. Sat. xi. 96. Colum. x. 344.

⁸ Τα γὰρ δὴ περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον ἡμενθυμένα παθὴ τοῦ διαμελισμοῦ, καὶ τὰ Τитῶν ἐπ' αὐτὸν τολμηματα, γευσάμενων τε τοῦ φονοῦ κολασεῖς (τε τούτων delend.) καὶ κεραυνόσεις, πηγμένος ἐστὶ μῦθος εἰς τὴν παλιγγενεσίαν. Plutarch. de Carn. Orat. i. Οὐκ ἀπο τροποῦ μυθολογοῦσι τὴν Ὀσιρίδος ψυχὴν αἰδιὸν εἶναι καὶ ἀφθαρτον, τὸ δὲ σῶμα πολλακὶς διασπῆν. καὶ ἀφανίζειν τὸν Τυφῶνα. Id. de Is. et Osir.

⁹ ἢ τὴν ἐπερχομένην Βρομιαχαρίσ.

⁹ Demosth. περὶ Στεφ. p. 568. Jul. Firmic. p. 14. ed. Ouz.

dence,¹ or foresight: wherefore his being bound in the extremities of the earth, signified originally no more than the restriction of the power of the sun during the winter months; though it has been variously embellished and corrupted by the poets; partly, perhaps, from symbolical compositions ill understood: for the vulture might have been naturally employed as an emblem of the destroying power. Another emblem of this power, much distinguished in the ancient Scandinavian mythology, was the wolf; who in the last day was expected to devour the sun:² and among the symbolical ornaments of a ruined mystic temple at Puzzuoli, we find a wolf devouring grapes; which, being the fruit peculiarly consecrated to Bacchus, are not unfrequently employed to signify that god. Lycopolis in Ægypt takes its name from the sacred wolf kept there;³ and upon the coins of Cartha in the island of Ceos, the forepart of this animal appears surrounded with diverging rays, as the centre of an asterisk.⁴

125. As putrefaction was the most general means of natural destruction or dissolution, the same spirit of superstition, which turned every other operation of nature into an object of devotion, consecrated it to the personification of the destroying power: whence, in the mysteries and other sacred rites belonging to the generative attributes, every thing putrid, or that had a tendency to putridity, was carefully avoided; and so strict were the Ægyptian priests upon this point, that they wore no garments made of any animal substance; but circumcised themselves, and shaved their whole bodies even to their eye-brows, lest they should unknowingly harbour any filth, excrement, or vermin supposed to be bred from putrefaction.⁵ The common fly, being, in its first stage of existence, a principal agent in dissolving and dissipating all putrescent bodies, was adopted as an emblem of the Deity to represent the destroying attribute: whence the Baal-Zebug, or Jupiter Fly of the Phœnicians, when admitted into the creed of the Jews, received the rank and office of prince of the devils. The symbol was humanised at an early period, probably by the Phœnicians themselves; and thus

¹ Pindar. Olymp. Z. 81.

² Lupus devorabit
Seculorum patrem. Edda Sæmundi. liii.

See also Mallet, *Introd. à l'Hist. de Danemar.* c. vi.

³ Macrobian. Sat. 1. c. xvii.

⁴ The wolf is also the device on those of Argos.

⁵ Εσθητα δε φορεουσιν οι ιερεις λινην μονην, και υποδηματα βυβλινα. Herodot. lib. ii. s. 37. Τα τε αιδιοα περιταμνονται καθαριστητος εινεκεν. Ibid.

Οι δε ιερεις ξυρευνται παν το σωμα δια τριτης ημερης, ινα μητε φθειρ, μητε αλλο μυσαρον εγγιγνηται σφι θεραπευουσιν τους θεους. Ibid.

formed into one of those fantastic compositions, which ignorant antiquaries have taken for wild efforts of disordered imagination, instead of regular productions of systematic art.¹

126. Bacchus frequently appears accompanied by leopards;² which in some instances are employed in devouring clusters of grapes, and in others drinking the liquor pressed from them; though they are in reality incapable of feeding upon that or any other kind of fruit. On a very ancient coin of Acanthus, too, the leopard is represented, instead of the lion, destroying the bull:³ wherefore we have no doubt that in the Bacchic processions, it means the destroyer accompanying the generator; and contributing, by different means, to the same end. In some instances his chariot is drawn by two leopards, and in others by a leopard and a goat coupled together:⁴ which are all different means of signifying different modes and combinations of the same ideas. In the British Museum is a group in marble of three figures, the middle one a human form growing out of a vine, with leaves and clusters of grapes growing out of its body. On one side is an androgynous figure representing the Mises or Bacchus *διφυνς*; and on the other a leopard, with a garland of ivy round its neck, leaping up and devouring the grapes, which spring from the body of the personified vine; the hands of which are employed in receiving another cluster from the Bacchus. This composition represents the vine between the creating and destroying attributes of the Deity; the one giving it fruit, and the other devouring it when given. The poets conveyed the same meaning in the allegorical tales of the Loves of Bacchus and Ampelus; who, as the name indicates, was only the vine personified.

127. The Chimera, of which so many whimsical interpretations have been given by the commentators on the Iliad, seems to have been an emblematical composition of the same class, veiled, as usual, under historical fable to conceal its meaning from the vulgar. It was composed of the forms of the goat, the lion, and the serpent; the symbols of the generator, destroyer, and preserver united and animated by fire, the essen-

¹ See Winkelman *Mon. ant. ined.* No. 13; and *Hist. des Arts*, Liv. iii. c. ii. p. 143.

² These are frequently called tigers: but the first tiger seen by the Greeks or Romans was presented by the ambassadors of India to Augustus, while settling the affairs of Asia, in the year of Rome 734. *Dion. Cass. Hist. lib. liv. s. 9.*

³ In the cabinet of Mr. Knight.

⁴ See medal of Maronea. *Gesner. tab. xliii. fig. 26.*

tial principle of all the three. The old poet had probably seen such a figure in Asia; but knowing nothing of mystic lore, which does not appear to have reached Greece or her colonies in his time, received whatever was told him concerning it. In later times, however, it must have been a well-known sacred symbol; or it would not have been employed as a device upon coins.

128. The fable of Apollo destroying the serpent Python, seems equally to have originated from the symbolical language of imitative art; the title Apollo signifying, according to the etymology already given, the destroyer as well as the deliverer: for, as the ancients supposed destruction to be merely dissolution, as creation was merely formation, the power which delivered the particles of matter from the bonds of attraction, and broke the δεσμον περιβριθη ερωτος, was in fact the destroyer. Hence the verb *ΑΤΩ* or *ΑΤΜΙ*, from which it is derived, means both to free and to destroy.¹ Pliny mentions a statue of Apollo by Praxiteles, much celebrated in his time, called ΣΑΤΡΟΚΤΟΝΟΣ,² the lizard-killer, of which several copies are now extant.³ The lizard, being supposed to exist upon the dews and moisture of the earth, was employed as the symbol of humidity; so that the god destroying it, signifies the same as the lion devouring the horse, and Hercules killing the centaur: that is, the sun exhaling the waters. When destroying the serpent, he only signifies a different application of the same power to the extinction of life; whence he is called ΠΤΘΙΟΣ,⁴ or the putrefier, from the verb ΠΤΘΩ. The title ΣΜΙΝΘΕΥΣ too, supposing it to mean, according to the generally received interpretation, mouse-killer, was expressive of another application of the same attribute: for the mouse was a priapic animal;⁵ and is frequently employed as such in monuments of ancient art.⁶ The statue, likewise, which Pausanias mentions of Apollo with his foot upon the head of a bull, is an emblem of similar meaning.⁷

¹ See Iliad A. 20, & I. 25.

² Lib. xxxiv. c. viii.

³ See Winkelman Mon. ant. incd. pl. xl.

⁴ Πυθιος απο του πυθειν, id est σηπειν. Macrob. Sat. I. c. xvii.

⁵ Ælian. Hist. Anim. lib. xii. c. 10.

⁶ It was the device upon the coins of Argos, (Jul. Poll. onom. ix. vi. 86.) probably before the adoption of the wolf, which is on most of those now extant. A small one, however, in gold, with the mouse, is in the cabinet of Mr. P. Knight.

⁷ Καὶ Ἀπολλων χαλκους γυμνος εσθητος. — και ετερω ποδι επι κρανιου βεβηκε βοος. Pausan. Achaic. c. xx. s. 2.

48 *An Inquiry into the Symbolical Language*

129. The offensive weapons of this deity, which are the symbols of the means by which he exerted his characteristic attribute, are the bow and arrows, signifying the emission of his rays; of which the arrow or dart, the βέλος or οβελος, was, as before observed, the appropriate emblem. Hence he is called ΑΦΗΤΩΡ, ΕΚΑΤΟΣ and ΕΚΑΤΗΒΟΛΟΣ; and also, ΧΡΤΣΑΩΡ and ΧΡΤΣΑΟΡΟΣ; which have a similar signification; the first syllable expressing the golden color of rays, and the others their erect position: for αορ does not signify merely a sword, as a certain writer, upon the authority of common Latin versions and school Lexicons, has supposed: but any thing that is held up; it being the substantive of the verb αείρω.

130. Hercules destroying the hydra, signifies exactly the same as Apollo destroying the serpent and the lizard;¹ the water-snake comprehending both symbols; and the ancient Phœnician Hercules being merely the lion humanised. The knowledge of him appears to have come into Europe by the way of Thrace; he having been worshipped in the island of Thasus, by the Phœnician colony settled there, five generations before the birth of the Theban hero;² who was distinguished by the same title that he obtained in Greece; and whose romantic adventures have been confounded with the allegorical fables related of him. In the Homeric times, he appears to have been utterly unknown to the Greeks, the Hercules of the Iliad and Odyssey being a mere man, pre-eminently distinguished indeed for strength and valor, but exempt from none of the laws of mortality.³ His original symbolical arms, with which he appears on the most ancient medals of Thasus, were the same as those of Apollo;⁴ and his Greek name, which, according to the most probable etymology, signifies the glorifier of the earth, is peculiarly applicable to the Sun. The Romans held him to be the same as Mars;⁵ who was sometimes represented under the same form, and considered as the same deity as Apollo;⁶

¹ Τῷ μὲν Ἡλίῳ τὸν Ἡρακλέα μυθολογοῦσιν ἐνιδρυμένον συμπεριτολεῖν. Plutarch. de Is. et Osir.

² Herodot. lib. ii. c. 44.

³ Iliad ζ. 117. Odysse. A. 600. The three following lines, alluding to his deification, have long been discovered to be interpolated.

⁴ Strabo, lib. xv. p. 688. Athenæ, lib. xii. p. 512. The club was given him by the Epic poets, who made the mixed fables of the Theban hero and personified attribute the subjects of their poems.

⁵ Varro apud Macrobi. Sat. 1. c. xx.

⁶ Ἐκ μὲν Λητοῦς δ' Ἀπολλῶν' ἐκ δὲ Ἡρας δ' Ἀρης γεγενε' μια δὲ ἐστὶν ἀμφοτέρων ἡ δύναμις. — οὐκοῦν ἢ τε Ἡρα καὶ ἡ Λητώ δυο εἰσι μίας θεοῦ προσηγορίαι. Plutarch. apud Euseb. Præp. Evang. lib. iii. c. 1.

and in some instances we find him destroying the vine instead of the serpent,¹ the deer, the centaur, or the bull; by all which the same meaning, a little differently modified, is conveyed: but the more common representation of him destroying the lion is not so easily explained; and it is probable that the traditional history of the deified hero has, in this instance as well as some others, been blended with the allegorical fables of the personified attribute: for we have never seen any composition of this kind upon any monument of remote antiquity.²

131. Upon the pillars which existed in the time of Herodotus in different parts of Asia, and which were attributed by the Ægyptians to Sesostris, and by others to Memnon, was engraved the figure of a man holding a spear in his right hand and a bow in his left; to which was added, upon some of them, *γυναικός αἰδοία*, said by the Ægyptians to have been meant as a memorial of the cowardice and effeminacy of the inhabitants, whom their monarch had subdued.³ The whole composition was however, probably, symbolical; signifying the active power of destruction, and passive power of generation; whose co-operation and conjunction are signified in so many various ways in the emblematical monuments of ancient art. The figure holding the spear and the bow is evidently the same as appears upon the ancient Persian coins called Darics, and upon those of some Asiatic cities, in the Persian dress; but which, upon those of others, appears with the same arms, and in the same attitude, with the lion's skin upon its head.⁴ This attitude is that of kneeling upon one knee; which is that of the Phœnician Hercules upon the coins of Thasus above cited: wherefore we have no doubt that he was the personage meant to be represented; as he continued to be afterwards upon the Bactrian and Parthian coins. The Hindoos have still a corresponding deity, whom they call Ram; and the modern Persians a fabulous hero, called Rustam, whose exploits are in many respects similar to those of Hercules, and to whom they attribute all the stupendous remains of ancient art found in their country.

¹ Mus. Florent. in gemm. t. 1. pl. xcii. 9.

² The earliest coins which we have seen with this device are of Syacuse, Tarentum, and Heraclea in Italy; all of the finest time of the art, and little anterior to the Macedonian conquest. On the more ancient medals of Selinus, Hercules is destroying the bull, as the lion or leopard is on those of Acanthus; and his destroying a centaur signifies exactly the same as a lion destroying a horse; the symbols being merely humanised.

³ Herodot. lib. ii. 102 and 106.

⁴ See coins of Mallus in Cilicia, and Soli in Cyprus, in the Hunter Collection.

132. It was observed, by the founders of the mystic system, that the destructive power of the Sun was exerted most by day, and the generative by night: for it was by day that it dried up the waters and produced disease and putrefaction; and by night that it returned the exhalations in dews tempered with the genial heat that had been transfused into the atmosphere. Hence, when they personified the attributes, they worshipped the one as the diurnal and the other as the nocturnal sun; calling the one Apollo, and the other Dionysus or Bacchus;¹ both of whom were anciently observed to be the same god; whence, in a verse of Euripides, they are addressed as one, the names being used as epithets.² The oracle at Delphi was also supposed to belong to both equally;³ or, according to the expression of a Latin poet, to the united and mixed deity of both.⁴

133. This mixed deity appears to have been represented in the person of the Apollo Didymæus; who was worshipped in another celebrated oracular temple near Miletus; and whose symbolical image seems to be exhibited in plates xii. xliii. and iv. of volume 1. of the Select Specimens; and in different compositions on different coins of the Macedonian kings; sometimes sitting on the prow of a ship, as lord of the waters, or Bacchus Hyes;⁵ sometimes on the cortina, the veiled cone or egg; and sometimes leaning upon a tripod; but always in an androgynous form, with the limbs, tresses, and features of a woman; and holding the bow or arrow, or both; in his hands.⁶ The

¹ In sacris enim hæc religiosi arcani observantia tenetur, ut Sol, cum in superno, id est in diurno Hemispherio est, Apollo vocitetur; cum in infero, id est nocturno, Dionysus, qui et Liber pater habeatur. Macrob. Sat. i. c. 18. Hence Sophocles calls Bacchus

Ἑρπνεοντων χορηγον αστερων. apud Eustath. p. 511.

and he had temples dedicated to him under correspondent titles. Ἐστὶ μὲν Διονυσίου ναὸς Νυκτελίου. Pausan. in Att. c. 40. s. 5. Ἱερόν — Διονύσου Λαμπτήρος ἐστὶν ἐπικλησίαν. Paus. Act. c. 27. s. 2. Hence too the corresponding deity among the Egyptians was lord of the Inferi. Ἀρχηγετέυειν δὲ τῶν κατὰ Αἰγυπτίους λεγούσι Δημητρά καὶ Διονύσον. Herodot. lib. ii. 123. Aristoteles, qui theologumena scripsit, Apollinem et Liberum patrem unum eundemque deum esse, cum multis argumentis, asserit. Macrob. Sat. i. c. 17.

² Δεσποτὰ φιλοδαφνε, Βακχε, Παιαν, Απολλων ευλυρε. Apud eund.

³ — Τὸν Διονύσον, ᾧ τῶν Δελφῶν οὐδὲν ἦττον ἢ τῷ Απολλωνί μετεστίν. Plutarch. ei apud Delph. p. 388.

⁴ Mons Phœbo Bromioque sacer; cui numine mixto Delphica Thebanæ referunt trieterica Bacchæ.

Lucan. Phars. v. 73.

⁵ (Ἑλληνες) καὶ τὸν Διονύσον, Ἐνν, ὡς κυρίον τῆς ὑγρας φύσεως, οὐχ' ἕτερον οὐτὰ του Οσιριδος (καλουσι.) Plutarch. de Is. et Osir.

⁶ See medals of Antigonos, Antiochus I., Seleucus II. and III., and other kings of Syria; and also of Magnesia ad Mæandrum, and ad Sipylum. The beautiful

double attribute, though not the double sex, is also frequently signified in figures of Hercules; either by the cup or cornucopie held in his hand, or by the chaplet of poplar or some other symbolical plant, worn upon his head; whilst the club or lion's skin indicates the adverse power.

134. In the refinement of art, the forms of the lion and goat were blended into one fictitious animal to represent the same meaning, instances of which occur upon the medals of Capua, Panticapæum, and Antiochus VI. king of Syria, as well as in the frieze of the temple of Apollo Didymæus before mentioned. In the former, too, the destroying attribute is further signified by the point of a spear held in the mouth of the monster; and the productive, by the ear of corn under its feet.¹ In the latter, the result of both is shown by the lyre, the symbol of universal harmony, which is supported between them; and which is occasionally given to Hercules, as well as to Apollo. The two-faced figure of Janus seems to have been a composite symbol of the same kind, and to have derived the name from *Iao* or *Iawv*, an ancient mystic title of Bacchus. The earliest specimens of it extant are on the coins of Lampsacus and Tenedos, some of which cannot be later than the sixth century before the Christian æra; and in later coins of the former city, heads of Bacchus of the usual form and character occupy its place.

ON THE ORIGIN, PROGRESS, PREVALENCE, AND DECLINE OF IDOLATRY.

BY THE REV. G. TOWNSEND.

PART VII.—[Continued from No. XLVIII. p. 243.]

SECTION XIII.—*Origin of the Obscene Temple Worship.*

TO ascertain the real nature of the worship projected or established by Nimrod, and whether in his days that strange compound of lust and cruelty, of which we too frequently read,

figure engraved on plates xliii. and iv. of vol. i. of the *Select Specimens* is the most exquisite example of this androgynous Apollo.

¹ Numm. Pembrok. tab. v. fig. 12

originated; we must collect the scattered notices respecting him, which are contained both in ancient history and the Hindoo legends. We shall find that each confirms the other, and their joint testimony seems almost to demonstrate the truth of the position, which may appear, at first sight, strange and unusual to the generality of those who have not given much of their attention to these subjects.

From the Hindoo legends respecting Ninus or Nimrod, part of which are collected in a paper by Lieutenant Wilford in the third volume of the *Asiatic Researches*, we learn that Maha Deva, or the great God, was born again in the character of Bel-Eswara, or God the Infant; in whose name the Linga, or Phallus, was first erected on the banks of the Cumud-vati or Euphrates. The several circumstances adduced by the legendary writers, completely identify Bel-Eswara with Ninus. Ninus married Semiramis. Bel-Eswara married Sama-Rama, or more properly, Sami-Ramési: and the history of both is the same. Sami-Rama is the word from which the Samarim, or the followers of the Dove, that is the Cuthite followers of Nimrod, derived their title; and that these united with Nimrod in commencing this abominable worship, is confirmed by Diodorus Siculus, who tells us, that Semiramis brought an obelisk from the mountains of Armenia, and erected it in the most conspicuous part of Babylon.

The account from Scripture tells us that the tower was left unfinished. Nebuchadnezzar is supposed to have completed it according to the original intention and plan of the founder. It was finished after the model of other temples, and in that manner in which tradition affirmed that it would have been completed, if the builders had not been thus miraculously and forcibly dispersed. If therefore we can ascertain the exact description of the temple, when thus perfected, we may justly believe that we shall have obtained accurate information of the nature and design of the original structure, and its implied corruptions.

Herodotus informs us, that the Babylonian temple of Belus was a vast square building, each side of which was not less than two furlongs in length; in the midst rose a massy tower, of the depth and height of a stadium; the tower itself was composed of seven towers, resting upon an eighth, which served as a basis, and successively diminishing in size from the bottom to the top. The ascent wound round it on the outside, thus imitating the circuitous ascent of a mountain: and in the last or

crowning tower, there was a large temple, provided with a splendid bed, and a golden table.

Whether the tower of Nimrod was, or was not, erected as the first imitation of Ararat, in commemoration of the arkite worship, we may certainly conclude that it was a high place formed on the very same plan as the other high places, or mountain temples of the pagans.

The septuagint translates the Hebrew word for high places by the term *πορνεῖον*, *Lupanar*. "Jehoram," says the inspired writer, "made high places in the mountains of Judah, and caused the inhabitants of Jerusalem to commit fornication." Ezekiel describes the manner in which the recesses in the temples, where the Priests and the consecrated prostitutes retired, were enclosed with hangings and garments. "Of thy garments didst thou take, and deckedst thy high places with divers colors, and playedst the harlot thereon." The women, we read in another place, wove hangings for the grove of Ashtarothe or Astarte: and with these garments, hangings or curtains, says Bishop Patrick, they encompassed their idols, and made a kind of house for them, as the Hebrew word implies, which the Greeks called *ναῖδα*, that is, little temples or habitations, into which the worshippers retired, and before the image of their deity committed their detestable worship. These places too were called *succoth-beneth*, which we read were made by the people of Babylon: the word means, not only the title of a deity, but the tabernacle of daughters, or of young women, that is, the chapels in which their daughters were prostituted. Jeremiah too, when describing the Babylonian idolatry, relates the infamous dedication of their virginity at the shrine of their idol, by the women, in the same manner as Herodotus describes the custom. "The women also with cords about them, sitting in the ways, burn bran for perfume: but if any of them, drawn by some that passeth by, lie with him; she reproacheth her fellow, that she was not thought as worthy as herself, nor her cord broken." "That is," says Dr. Hyde (in his *Religio vet. Pers.*), "they sate crowned with garlands, and their lower garments were tied with small and weak cords made of rushes." "Every woman at Babylon," says Herodotus, "is obliged once in her life to sit down openly in the temple of Venus, in order to prostitute herself to some stranger: the wealthy, who disdain to expose themselves in public among the rest, come in covered chariots to the gates of the temple, leaving their servants at a distance. But the greater part enter into the temple, (for the prostitution was always a religious ceremony) and sit down crowned with

garlands. The galleries where they sit, are built in a strait line, and are open on every side, that all strangers may pass freely, and select the women they may prefer. The stranger throws a piece of money into the lap of the woman he chooses; this money is consecrated to Venus; and the present, however small, may not be refused, because it is accounted sacred."

The bran burnt for a perfume, was supposed to be intended as a love portion, or incentive. Among the plates to Moor's Hindu Pantheon, are several figures of women offering up their homage to their deities, with a small fire burning before them. Herodotus gives an account of this custom, which may not be transcribed.

Though I fear too much has been already said on this point, I cannot conclude the present argument without adducing some few additional instances to prove, that wherever the other superstitions, which have been traced by various authors to the age of the dispersion, or to that immediately succeeding it, were established, there also the custom of prostitution in the temples as a religious rite, as uniformly prevailed. They are collected by Young in his *Treatise on Idolatry*, and by the great Whitby, in his valuable, though too much neglected work, on the *Necessity of the Christian Revelation*.

At Abydos, Samos, Ephesus, and at other places in Asia Minor, temples were built in honor of Venus, where the Phœnicians prostituted their daughters before marriage. Strabo affirms, that the Babylonians were directed to do the same by an oracle. Athenæus tells us, that the Lydians, the Locrians, and the Cyprians consecrated their daughters by this vice to their deities. The Cappadocians were so notorious for this practice, that their chief city was called a little Corinth: Corinth, it is well known, being so much celebrated for its infamy, that the term to *Corinthianise* was proverbial throughout Greece. Athanasius declares that the Phœnician women trusted by this means to propitiate their goddess. The Egyptians are said to have been the first who prohibited public prostitution in their temples; yet the prohibition was either not universal, or it was not obeyed; for even Juvenal uses the contemptuous term "bawd," when alluding to the solemnities of the Isiac worship, and speaking of the goddess. In Sicca, a colony of Africa, the matrons were guilty of the same religion; and to conclude the dark catalogue, though many more might be added, the public laws of Armenia compelled their noblest families to consecrate their virgins to their deity, by a long continuance of such debasing homage. That the same superstition prevailed at

Rome is proved by the story of the Roman knight, who being unable to corrupt the chastity of a Roman matron, bribed a priest to declare that the god desired possession of her person in the temple. The lady, obedient to the superstitions of the country, submitted to the embraces of the supposed deity (who of course was the knight in question), and imagined that she was honored by his approbation. Such a transaction could not possibly have taken place at Rome in the reign of Augustus, if the idea had not been universal among the heathen nations, that the gods sometimes became incarnate, and demanded the persons of women, who became in some measure sacred, and devoted to the god: and that it was the duty of the most virtuous matron to yield implicit obedience to the declared choice of their deity.

To this idea, that the gods became incarnate to enjoy the company of women, may be attributed the stories of Jupiter and Alcmena, Semele and Bacchus, Hercules and Omphale, and innumerable others.

By him who considers the whole of this evidence,—the Hindoo legends; the scriptural account; the narrative of Herodotus; and the apparent identity between the obscene worship in the temples of the pagans in general, and that which is implied by his description of the tower of Babel, when completed on the plan of its founder;—in summing up these various testimonies, it will not be thought that I come to an unwarranted or rash conclusion, that the practice of these iniquitous degradations, as it cannot be traced to a subsequent age, and was so universal, originated at Babylon when under the dominion of Nimrod; and one of the secondary causes of the forcible dispersion, and the defeat of his enterprise, was the division produced among his followers by this daring innovation. The next question therefore which presents itself is, on what plausible pretence it was possible that Nimrod could have been so infatuated, as to have recommended or adopted this infamous innovation?

The gods of the Pagans were the sun, the host of heaven, and deified mortals. Many have imagined that the phallic worship originated in a typical commemoration of the productive powers of nature, which were revived every year at the commencement of spring; and this idea seems to be confirmed by the universal custom, which has obtained in all nations, of the celebration of the return of that delightful season: and I believe it is an undoubted fact that even the May-pole, which is still adorned with flowers, and danced round by the people, is the genuine relic of the old idolatrous rites observed in the phallic

worship. It is probable that this more speculative opinion, however, prevailed at a subsequent period. Instead of deriving the phallic abominations from perverted astronomy, it seems rather to be connected with the still grosser corruptions of the temple worship, and deduced from the mistaken homage paid to their deified ancestors.

We learn from comparing the legends of the Hindoos with the best interpretations of the mythology of Greece and Rome, that not only Noah was venerated as the great father of mankind, the great mother also was supposed to be entitled to their homage. It is more than probable, as the belief in the incarnation was so prevalent among them, and as it was well known that the promised Incarnate was to be descended from woman, in a manner that should distinguish him from mere mortals, that the reputed mother of the Incarnate was likewise esteemed sacred. Now we find that though the nuptial relationship between the great father and the great mother was ever remembered, yet the latter was frequently considered a virgin, and "was thought by her own energy alone to have given birth to the principal hero deity." In veneration or in imitation of this supposed virginity, colleges of consecrated maidens were established, with a regular monastic discipline; and a breach of their vows of chastity was followed by the most terrific punishment, whether among the vestals at Rome, in other quarters of the old continent, or in that of America. This part, however, of their inconsistent worship did not for one moment interfere with the natural consequence of the deification of their ancestors. The great father whom they worshipped was a god, and was married. The lineal descendants of that father were divine personages. As the great mother became holy in consequence of her union with their exalted ancestor, the descendants also of that father and mother, who were the incarnate representatives of their glory, were enabled also to confer a portion of their own divinity to the women whom they honored with their approbation. The consequences of this profligate usurpation are easily seen, and are confirmed by the united testimony of all ancient history. The priests assumed in their respective settlements the powers thus claimed by the daring descendants of Ham and Chus; the women became prostitutes in the temples, from a principle of mistaken religion, believing that they propitiated the deity by the most open and unrestrained licentiousness; and in many instances they were not even permitted to marry till they had devoted to Venus Mylitta, or to the same goddess under different names, the price of their virginity, which must be sacrificed

in the precincts of the temples. The description of these scenes given by Herodotus, by the prophet Jeremiah, by Livy, in his account of the banishment of the chief actors from Rome, and by many others, paints more accurately the customs and religious profligacy of the greater part of Greece, of Asia Minor, the Canaanites, and of the inhabitants of India, the last of whom continue their flagitious worship even to this day.

To other abominations of the Pagans we can only allude, and pass on to our subject. The union of the great father and mother was thought to be of so intimate a nature, that it was even inseparable. They ceased to be two distinct persons; the one became a component part of the other; and thus a single divine being was produced, whose compound person partook of both sexes. Warburton and Cudworth suppose that this hermaphroditic union was made on account of the Pagans retaining some remembrance of the divine unity. Mr. Faber rejects this idea, and I do not so well remember Cudworth's argument as to be able to decide upon the point; though it is improbable that the pristine race could have so soon lost all remembrance of the religion of their fathers, while they were evidently so bent on retaining their ancient ritual. However this may be, the consequences were such, as in this moral and enlightened age may not be mentioned, and scarcely hinted. It was the custom of the priests and priestesses to imitate, in their infernal and yet mystic orgies, the deity they served. They assumed his titles; personated his character; ascribed to themselves his attributes; and endeavoured to exhibit by action, the metaphysical notions attached to his mythological history. "Such notions (I now use Mr. Faber's words) produced the corruptions of the phallic worship, and the solemn prostitution of female virtue, even when the great father and the great mother were considered as two distinct persons, severally presiding over the powers of generation: but when they were viewed as a single person partaking of both sexes, and alone presiding over both powers, it is easy to conceive what monstrous enormities were the consequences among a race of theologists, who deemed it laudable and meritorious to imitate in their own persons the supposed character and actions of their deity. The priests, while they assumed the titles of their god, studied also to take upon them his imagined hermaphroditic nature. They wore the dress, and copied the manners of women: they literally, urged by frantic enthusiasm, ceased to be men: and while they endeavoured, in imitation of their deity, to partake of both sexes, they really failed to partake of either. Scripture abounds in allusions to

the practices attendant upon this mode of worship; and in order to preserve the Israelites from being contaminated by them, it strikes at the root of the evil, by especially prohibiting men to appear in the garb of women, or women in the garb of men. Suffice it to observe that the practices in question were such, that the land of Canaan is even said, in the nervous metaphorical phraseology of holy writ, to have vomited out, in very disgust, its polluted inhabitants."

It is not probable that this system was absolutely perfected at Shinar; but there is sufficient reason to suppose that it originated there; and in allusion to such worship it is, that Babylon is so emphatically termed throughout scripture, the source of all idolatrous corruption: as the mother of harlots; as the nurse of all the abominations of the earth.

SECTION. XIV.—*Origin of the Sacrifice of Human Victims.*

We now come to another eminent characteristic of the ancient idolatry; their cruel and murderous sacrifices. This subject has been so exhausted by the labors of our great authors, - in the admirable work of Dr. Magee on the atonement; in the chapter of Mr. Faber on the origin and purport of sacrificial rites; in Outram's celebrated work *De Sacrificiis*, and in a small but valuable tract, on the atonement, by Dr. Pye Smith, the head of the Dissenting Academy at Homerton,—that I shall not attempt the superfluous labor of proving from the joint testimony of these and other writers, that sacrifice was a divine institution, of a propitiatory nature, typical of the only true, propitiatory atoning sacrifice of the divine victim, the Messiah of the Church of God. I wish only to trace the origin of that corruption, which led to such terrible results among all the Pagan nations. The question is, whether the cruelties, as well as the obscenities of heathenism, originated under the influence of Nimrod at Shinar.

There is not, and cannot be, any apparent connexion between the shedding the blood of an animal, and the pardoning the crimes of man; yet this arbitrary idea has universally prevailed, among all the heathen tribes of which history or tradition has left us any account. We have the positive assertion of scripture that the blood of animals was offered in sacrifice to the true God, before the flood, and immediately after it; and the universal prevalence of the custom proves its common origin. We may naturally suppose that when the other corruptions of the ancient

patriarchal religion began to prevail, this sacred rite could not escape perversion. After examining the several authorities, which are generally considered most valuable, I am inclined to believe that the offering up of human sacrifices originated not at Shinar, but from a mistaken apprehension of the scenical offering of Isaac, by his father Abraham.

There are many reasons which might induce us to suppose that some cruel rites were practised at Shinar. The ancient war god, to whom a love of slaughter was attributed, is always represented with a sword in his hand. The Targum of Jonathan, the Targum of Jerusalem, and the rabbinical author of the Bereschit Rabba, all agree in describing the tower of Babel as being crowned with a temple, in which was placed an idol with a sword in his hand; and the Cuthite tribes, who followed in the respective settlements the Brahminical idolatry, have uniformly more rigidly practised these cruel ceremonies than their Buddhite brethren. It seems to be in direct contradiction to the hypothesis, which I have considered to be the most preferable, because it explains in the most consistent manner, corroborated too by scripture, the origin and general prevalence of superstition in the early ages. But as Christianity may be said to have originated in one spot, at Jerusalem, so might idolatry at Shinar: yet as the Papal corruptions, which were once universal, gradually became established in Rome; as Presbyterianism began at Geneva, and extended over much of Europe; as independence began in England, and has thence been transplanted into America; in the same manner certain modes, and shades of corruption, or peculiar kinds of perversion, originated in Egypt, or Phœnicia, from whence they gradually pervaded the several settlements of the Buddhite, or Brahmanic idolaters. There is therefore nothing inconsistent or contradictory in assigning the origin of idolatry to Shinar, though we still attach to Phœnicia the peculiar reproach of commencing, and extending the cruel sacrifice of human victims. We have no certain proof that human victims were offered prior to the time of Abraham; and the general authority of the most learned writers has assigned the commencement of these cruelties to the misapprehension among the heathens of the scenical sacrifice of Isaac.

The name of Abraham was as widely extended, and was as much celebrated, as that of the greatest conqueror whom the world has yet seen. He was at once a powerful prince, a distinguished warrior, a teacher of the true religion, and a steady opposer of the idolatrous innovations of his time. He repeatedly

traversed those countries which at that time were most enlightened in knowledge, though so much corrupted in opinion; and every where he inculcated the belief in one God, and taught and practised the uncorrupted patriarchy of their fathers. From Ur in Chaldæa, the very centre of the capital city of idolatry, he travelled through the whole of Haran, Mesopotamia, the north of Syria, the complete extent of Palestine, to Egypt; and again from Egypt to Sodom and Gomorrha, and from thence to the other side of Palestine. These countries formed at that time nearly the whole of the civilised world; and it is evident that he was well known among all, and that his religious conduct in particular would be thoroughly scrutinised, and imitated. Though the posthumous fame of an individual is not always a criterion that he was universally known when alive; yet where that fame has extended so widely as in the instance of Abraham, we are justly warranted in supposing that he could not have been other than an eminent and distinguished man: no individual, except Adam and Noah, has been so generally venerated as Abraham. The Jews and Arabians idolise his memory. The Chaldæans, Phœnicians, Indians, and Egyptians, according to the best historians, esteem him to have been one of the greatest and wisest of men; and the scripture testimony to his merits, piety, accomplishments, and excellence, in every department of life, is too express and decisive to require farther comment.

Whatever therefore of a religious nature, apparently novel, certainly most peculiar and extraordinary, was done by Abraham, would excite attention, respect, and imitation. In those early ages, religious instruction was communicated by action. At this particular period, when Isaac was to be offered, the general attention would have been directed to Abraham, in an unusual manner. The cities of the plain had been destroyed by miraculous lightnings, and subterranean fires, after Abraham had in vain entreated their preservation. In the year after their destruction he visited Gerar (afterwards in the tribe of Simeon, the tribe nearest to Egypt), having interceded for the polluted cities at Mâmre. From Gerar he travelled with his large and princely retinue, to Beersheba, "in the Philistines' land," on the borders of Palestine and Egypt. I mention these places, because they and the others which are mentioned in this part of scripture, from which this account is taken, were all situated on the southern border of Palestine, adjacent to the surrounding idolaters, and the patriarchal king of Egypt, Abimelech. Nothing therefore of a public nature could be unknown to either

of them. From Beersheba he was directed to proceed with Isaac several days' journey into the very heart of the country, to offer him as a burnt-offering upon the mountain, on which the real sacrifice was offered in a subsequent age.

When the circumstances in which the Patriarch was now placed, are taken into consideration; when it is remembered that the words, "offer him as a burnt-offering," implied that the body of his son was to be divided asunder, and then burnt to ashes: when the public nature of the command, the probable tears, and unrestrained lamentations of Sarah; the intimate union that subsisted between Abraham and the king of the country, which would have made it impossible to have kept the reason of this long journey secret; the public planting of a grove in Beersheba by Abraham, a short time only before this event, implying his intention of continuing in the country; when all these things are considered, it will be evident that the fame and report of the action now about to be committed by the patriarch, in obedience to the commands of God, would be extensively known. Like the city on a hill, he could not be hid. All the surrounding nations, whether more or less perverted, or still attached to the patriarchal worship, would hear of the transaction, would eagerly inquire into its meaning, and, sooner or later, would pervert to wrong purposes the lesson now taught them respecting their future Messiah, as they had already perverted the other doctrines of religion. Sacrifice had been common to them all from the very beginning. Sheep and oxen only, had hitherto been sacrificed as the best portion of their wealth; and, by the shedding of their blood, as the only mode of propitiating the Deity. From this time, however, the doctrine of sacrifice was perverted, because it was considered that the life of a man was a more acceptable sacrifice than that of cattle; and as it was their duty to offer that which was most valuable, therefore they concluded that they were henceforth required to offer their sons as an atonement, as the most honorable and valuable victim. Thus as the most profligate corruption of idolatry originated from the perverted doctrine of the incarnation; so did the most cruel and murderous rite of human sacrifice originate from the perverted doctrine of the atonement.

We must here notice the objection of Philo to this part of our inquiry. Philo conjectures that God proposed to Abraham, as a test of his zeal for the true God, that usual sacrifice by which the heathen manifested their zeal for their false gods; and the learned Dr. Hales agrees with this opinion. But if we may judge by the analogy of the usual mode of God's

proceedings with mankind, this way of proving the faith of Abraham, by commanding him to sacrifice his son, was an actual demonstration that the custom of human sacrifices did not then prevail among the heathen: for the great object which the Deity appears to have had in view, by the frequent manifestations of himself and his will to the true worshippers, was this—to keep them from the surrounding corruptions, by teaching them to avoid the very appearance of complying with their abominations. The whole of those enactments of the Levitical law, which were not common to the patriarchal dispensation, were appointed on this principle, as is proved at large by Young on Idolatry, by Dean Allix, and many others, in a great variety of instances, which would occupy too much time to enumerate.

The first people, among whom we read of the custom of offering human victims prevailed, were those immediately adjacent to the country where Abraham lived at the time when he intended to have obeyed, to the utmost, the commands of God respecting Isaac: these nations must have been earlier acquainted with the history of the transaction, and therefore would be among the first to pervert it. Thus, Moab was the territory bounding the tribe of Judah, in which was Mamre, to the eastward, on the opposite side of the Asphaltite lake; of the people of Moab we read, that when its king was pressed in battle, “He took his eldest son, that should have reigned in his stead, and offered him for a burnt-offering.” Long prior, however, to this decided proof of the prevalence of this inhuman custom among the Moabites, Balak, the king of Moab, had the same notion, the superior validity of human sacrifices to propitiate the Deity, when he consulted Balaam on the best mode of conquering Israel. The prophet Micah has recorded the conversation. “Wherewith shall I come before the Lord? shall I come before him with burnt-offerings? or shall I give my first-born for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?”—This custom was notoriously prevalent among the Egyptians: Diodorus Siculus relates that it was an ancient custom, especially of the shepherd dynasty (founded in the time of Abraham), to sacrifice men; when the victims were burnt alive, and the ashes scattered in the air; a custom against which, as Mr. Bryant has beautifully shown, one of the plagues of Egypt was particularly directed. Abimelech, as Mr. Faber proves, was one of these very kings; and he was the friend and admirer of Abraham, the great teacher of the true religion. Abimelech seems to have been a worshipper of Jehovah. He therefore, and his subjects, must have known of the sacrifice of

Isaac, and probably deduced from this knowledge those opinions, which their descendants so lamentably perverted.

Phœnicia lay to the north of Palestine, and Abraham had travelled through a part of that country, in his journey from Haran to Egypt. Wherever Abraham went, he inculcated the knowledge of the true God : and he thus also became an object of curious and anxious attention to the surrounding nations. The Phœnicians were always a civilised and commercial people ; they are supposed to have had a very early knowledge of alphabetical writing, which chiefly through their means was communicated by their colonies and navigators to the nations of Europe. Being wealthy, their chief people would have had much leisure ; and as a necessary consequence, they would endeavour to preserve among them an accurate knowledge of the principal events of the surrounding nations ; particularly of that nation with which they carried on such an extensive commerce. We might naturally suppose therefore that more would remain of such a people, than of others who were less enlightened, though more powerful. This has actually been the case : while the very ruins of the histories of many great nations have been erased from the records of mankind, many scattered notices of the Phœnicians yet remain ; from which much additional illustration of the early periods of history is still to be collected. Among the traditions which have been preserved, one is particularly deserving our notice, from its intimate connexion with, and reputed reference to, the sacrifice of Isaac by Abraham.

MEMOIR

On the Antiquity of the Zodiacs of Esneh and Dendera.

PART III.—[Continued from No. XLVIII. p. 282.]

WHEN the Greeks stated the opinions of the Orientalists, it can scarcely be doubted that they not only mixed their own ideas with those of the strangers, whose science and whose language they imperfectly understood, but mingled and confused the notions of the vulgar among the Egyptians and Chaldeans, with the doctrines, the dogmas, and the

science of the Priests. We have only to open Stobæus, and Plutarch *de placitis Philosophorum*, to see how truths and falsehoods were blended together even by the Pythagoreans. But how did they get at the truths? Falsehoods are easily found; but how did they stumble upon facts, which science only can discover? When Archelaus said that the Moon was distant from the Earth by 56 or 59 semi-diameters of the earth, (I speak from memory) this could not be a mere guess; nor could Archelaus, who certainly could not have taken the Moon's parallax, have made so near an approach to the truth by any science of his own. Eratosthenes reckoned the Sun's distance from the Earth at 800,000,000 of Olympic stadia, about 90,000,000 of English miles. (See these measures calculated in my Essay on the Science of the Egyptians.) Posidonius, less accurate, calculated the distance at 502,000,000 of Italic stadia, which M. De Lambre reckons, by I know not what arithmetic, at 31 millions of leagues. The Italic stadium was of 625 French feet nearly. Now it is clear that these astronomers had no means of making such calculations. Are we therefore to call them *happy guesses* with M. De Lambre? This may be a happy—it is certainly a convenient way of proving, that the Greeks met with none of those remnants of science among the Egyptians and Babylonians, which Bailli has so ably argued that they must have found. But it is rather strange that these Greeks should have made so many happy, in the midst of so many unhappy, guesses; nor is it less singular, that most of their happy guesses are said by them to have been made by men who went for instruction to Egypt and Chaldaea. Pythagoras, who spent the better part of his life at Memphis and Babylon, guessed that the Sun is in the *centre* of our planetary system. His disciples guessed the true nature of comets—the distance, nearly exact, of the Sun and Moon from the Earth, and the number of stadia comprised in an arc of the meridian. The Chaldeans appear to have made all these guesses before the Pythagoreans. Thales, during his stay in Egypt, learned to guess the time of an eclipse. Democritus guessed, as it may be thought from a passage in Hyde, like the ancient Chaldeans and Magi, that the galaxy is composed of an immense number of stars. The Egyptians placed their pyramids by guess, so as to make their sides answer to the four cardinal points; and thus did by guess, what others can only do

when they know how to take a meridian. The Chaldeans guessed that the Earth is 400,000 (short) stadia in circumference, about 25,038 English miles. This was certainly a very happy guess; but of course it was only a guess. We ought consequently to believe, on the faith of any Greek astrologer who had wandered to Babylon, and who had conversed as well as he could with the ignorant astrologers of his time, that the astronomers of Chaldea, even those who had observed the heavens from the tower of Belus, long destroyed before the age of Epigenes, had always believed comets to be *tourbillons* of fiery matter.

But is the method followed by M. De Lambre really that by which we can best elicit truth from the testimony of the Greeks? If two Asiatic astrologers were now to visit England, and to learn a little of our language, it is probable that they might carry home with them more of Moore's almanack in their heads, than of Newton's *Principia*. Let us suppose that one of them mixed something of both in his mind, and told his countrymen of some of the splendid discoveries in science made by the English; while his companion recited verses from the wizard Moore, and assured his hearers that we were all believers in the astral influences. Then, if in the revolution of ages the descendants of these Asiatics became skilful astronomers, while England had fallen from her high estate, had fallen even as Babylon has fallen, they would believe, if they reasoned on the principles of M. De Lambre, that the English were astrologers, but not astronomers; that Moore was our great philosopher, and that Newton guessed at the doctrine of gravitation, as Herschell has since guessed at the existence of the planet *Uranus*.

M. De Lambre has introduced Manetho into his history of astronomy. Whether for the purpose of aiming a blow at Bailli, while he attacks Josephus, or of depreciating the science of the Egyptians, or of candidly examining the Ἀποτελεσματικά, ascribed to Manetho, I must leave others to judge. I might perhaps contend, and with Tyrwhitt on my side, that the poem in question is not Manetho's, and that the first and fifth books were not written by the same author who composed the rest. But still I am inclined to think, that this very unpoetical poem may have been composed while the Greeks were yet masters of Egypt. M. De Lambre treats the knowledge of astronomy exhibited by the writer with the most profound contempt. In this

he is probably quite right; but does he do justice to the Egyptians, when he extends his contempt to them, and argues that from this specimen we may judge of their progress in science? Let it be granted that Manetho was the author. Who can trace the fragments of his works, without seeing that this man was a clever impostor; and that, after having pretended to consult the columns in the Siriadie land, and the 36,000 volumes written by Thoth, he really was unable to compile his history from any archives which remained in his time? He also pretended, no doubt, to explain the hieroglyphics, and to reproduce all the wisdom of Hermes Trismegistus. In short, the more we hear of him, the more we ought to be convinced that his faith was bad, and his impostures numberless. He might know more of the traditions of the Egyptians, than was generally known in the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus; but his attempt to show that the ancient Gods of Egypt were only men deified by popular belief, would alone prove, that this servile courtier of Ptolemy, the son of Vulcan, as I think he is called in the Rosetta inscription, was but too willing to sacrifice truth to please his sovereign.

M. De Lambre has quoted some verses from the 5th book of the poem. These verses describe the signs of the zodiac; and M. De Lambre tells us that he has cited them, "*à cause des deux (trois) vers sur les Serres, dont les hommes sacrés ont changé le nom en celui de Balance, parce qu'elles s'étendent de part et d'autre comme des plats suspendus à un joug.*"

Χηλαὶ θ' ἄς καὶ μετεφήμεισαν ἄνδρες ἰσθί
 Καὶ ζυγὸν ἐκλήρισαν, ἐπεὶ τ' ἐτάνυσσ' ἐκάτερθε
 Οἷαι καὶ πλάστιγγες ἐπὶ ζυγίου ἐλκουμέναι.

The learned astronomer makes no remarks on these verses. It appears to me that Manetho means to say by them, that the constellation of Scorpius once occupied two dodecatemoria, or 60 degrees, but that the Priests of Egypt changed the name of the Scorpion's Claws into that of the Balance, giving at the same time the form of a balance to the claws. If this be the meaning, as I think it is, we should infer from it, that in the time of Manetho the Chaldeans, and the Greeks, who copied the Chaldean division of the zodiac, partitioned this circle into eleven constellations, while the Egyptians counted twelve. But this statement appears to be, in part at least,

extremely incorrect. I believe that the Chaldeans always divided the zodiac into eleven constellations; but the Egyptians never. The introduction of the 12 great Gods into Egypt was made 17,000 years before the reign of Amasis, according to the Egyptians, that is to say, at a very early period of their history, for I am not inclined to give them the slightest credit on the subject of chronology. Now these 12 Gods I conceive to be those that presided over the 12 signs of the zodiac. The Egyptians always appear, from the earliest accounts which we have of their zodiac, to have introduced the Balance into it. We know that they gave this name to the constellation, which the Greeks called *Χηλῶν*, both from the verses cited above, and from the words of Achilles Tatius—κατὰ τὰς χηλῶν, τὰς κεκλιμένους ὑπὸ Αἰγυπτίων ζυγόν. Now the Egyptians were not a people likely to change their names or their symbols at so late a period as some have imagined. Macrobius distinctly attributes to them the division of the zodiac into 12 signs. *Quis vero, inquiet, circi cælestis duodecim partes aut invenit, aut fecit?—Ægyptiorum retro majores, quos constat primos omnium cælum scrutari.* Not any proof is to be found, that the Egyptians ever divided the zodiac into 11 constellations; or that among them the scorpion occupied 60 degrees.

M. De Lambre seems to think that the same thing was true with respect to the Chaldeans. Whence then had the Alexandrian Greeks their division of the zodiac into 11 constellations? From whom, before their time, had Eudoxus, the father of Greek astronomy, learned to extend the constellation of Scorpius through 60 degrees, if not from the Chaldeans? M. De Lambre, at least, will not deny, that Eudoxus copied his sphere from that of the Chaldeans, and that he placed, like them, the equinoxial and solstitial colures in the middle of their respective signs *Aries, Chela,—Cancer, Capricornus*. But the learned astronomer argues from a passage in Ptolemy, that the Chaldeans must have reckoned the Balance among the signs.

I shall copy the passage as he gives it in French, not having the original at hand to refer to:—"C'étoit l'an 496 de Nabonassar, le 30 *payni*, soir, le Soleil moyen étoit en 4. 27. 50. L'élongation étoit donc orientale, et de 21. 40. —L'an 75, suivant les Chaldéens, le 14 du mois *Dios* ou de Jupiter, Mercure étoit d'une coudée au-dessus du joug

austral de la Balance ; ensorte que, selon nous, il devoit être en $14^{\circ} 10'$ des Serres, ou en $6^{\circ} 14^{\circ} 10'$." Now in this passage there is no little confusion. Ptolemy is describing the place of the planet Mercury at different epochs. He begins by giving us the year 496 of the period of Nabonassar; and as this was a Chaldean period, we might have expected that the month would have been named from the Chaldean nomenclature, or if not from the Chaldean, at least from the Greek, his own language. But no; Ptolemy names the Egyptian month *Payni*. In the next calculation we have the year 75 according to the Chaldeans—we might then expect an Egyptian month, since we had one before; and again we should be deceived. The month *Dios* is named by Ptolemy, which answered to the month of October in the calendar of the Syro-Macedonians. I should therefore conceive, that he alluded to the Egyptian zodiac, and not to the Chaldean, when he speaks of the Balance. I paraphrase the last sentence thus:—"In the year 75, according to the Chaldean mode of reckoning, the 11th day of the month called *Dios* by the Syro-Macedonians, Mercury was a cubit above the southern beam of the Balance, as this part of the zodiac is commonly called here in Egypt; so that according to us Greeks, this planet ought to have been at $14^{\circ} 10'$ of the Claws of the Scorpion, having 6 signs, 14 degrees, 10 minutes, of longitude." I rather think this will be found to be the sense of the passage. But there is no occasion to appeal to any disputed or disputable testimony. The evidence of Servius puts the matter beyond a doubt. *Egyptii*, says this writer, *duodecim esse asserunt signa; Chaldei vero undecim; num Scorpionum et Labrum unum signum accipiunt; Chelæ enim Scorpii Labrum faciunt*.

As I have said so much in opposition to M. De Lambre, I shall only add, that though I most sincerely and most highly admire the talents of this writer, and readily admit that his remarks on the astronomical knowledge of the Greeks abundantly display his acuteness and his science; yet I cannot but lament the prejudice which he manifestly shows, in almost all that he says relative to the progress made by the ancient Indians, Chaldeans, and Egyptians, in astronomy and mathematics. More learned than Montucla, he is yet more jealous than that writer, of the scientific reputation of the nations which I have just mentioned.

We have already seen, that those, who have hitherto endeavoured to explain the zodiacal symbols, have represented them as emblematical of the seasons, when the Sun in his annual course was passing through the signs. The explanation, which I would here propose, appears to me more obvious and natural. The constellations were of course partitioned during the night. Macrobius says that the Egyptians made this division by means of a clepsydra; and his account of the Egyptian process sufficiently resembles that given by Sextus Empiricus of the Chaldean method. The Egyptian clepsydra, being generally in the form of a *emmocephalus*, seems to indicate that the Egyptians had commenced their calculation at the rising, but I should think the achronical rising, of the Dog-star. I am indeed of opinion, that the zodiacal symbols were chosen to suit the seasons, as the stars of each dodecatemorion rose achronically in the order of the months. When I say achronically, however, I do not mean to use the word in all its strictness as it is generally understood by astronomers. Stars of the first magnitude are not visible until 12 or 14 minutes after sun-set; and the other stars are not all visible until after a much longer period. Besides this the denseness of the horizontal mists in all hot countries is to be considered; and the more so, that the sky above is so brilliant, that we are apt to overlook the vapors that shroud the horizon. When then I shall have to speak of stars which have risen achronically, let me be understood to mean those, which have ascended so far above the eastern horizon as to become distinctly visible.

If we suppose the zodiac to have been constructed, or rather reconstructed in Egypt, it may become a question in what latitude this was done; as Egypt extends north and south, from Damietta to Philæ, about seven degrees and a half. It seems to me that two cities, Heliopolis and Thebes, were the most likely to have disputed the honor of having invented, or, at least, of having reconstructed the zodiac.

The city of On, called Heliopolis by the Greeks, and Ain-shems by the Arabians, was situated about 24 miles to the north of Memphis. Three reasons induce me to mention this as a place where the zodiac was likely to be constructed anew for the use of the Egyptians:—1st, it appears from the Book of Genesis, that this city was one of the most distinguished of Egypt about 1700 years before

our æra; and that the worship of the Sun, as is clear from the names *On*, and *Potiphre*, (not Potipherah) or rather *Pithophre*, was already there established;—2ndly, the honors there rendered to the Bull, called *Mnevis* by the Greeks, seem to testify, that the Sun was originally adored at *On*, when *Taurus* was the leading constellation;—3rdly, it may be believed, that the zodiacal signs were represented in the temple of *On*, which must have been of very great antiquity. The following remarkable passage is

cited by Kircher from Artaphus: وكلن بعين شمس للهيككل
للشمس وويده اثني عشر الاعمود امتد ايمن ثنى عشر للاحروج
الاسرار للعنصر* Kircher thus interprets this sentence: *Fuit*

autem Heliopoli templum Solis, et in eo XII columnæ significantes XII signa zodiaci, et elementorum arcana. I am not

satisfied with this translation. The word *متل* means *that which is like to another thing*; in one word, *similis*. *بروج* no doubt signifies the zodiacal signs, but it properly signifies *towers*; for whether the Egyptians did or not, the ancient Persians and Arabians assigned a *tower* to each zodiacal constellation, and probably represented each dodecatemoron under the form of a tower. The word

عنصر does not signify the four elements, as Kircher seems to have understood it; but is to be referred to *عصر*, and consequently means what is primary with respect to time. These remarks would not have been worth making, if the Arabian author had not seemed to intimate, that the columns were formed in imitation of the *towers* by which the ancient Orientalists represented the signs of the zodiac. Perhaps the meaning would be more exactly expressed as follows:—*Exstitit Heliopoli (Arabice Ain-Shems) templum Solis, et in eo XII fuerunt columnæ, representantes XII turres, (signa zodiaci) mysteria perantiqua*—or perhaps *arcana veterum temporum*. There is no authority for the copulative, which Kircher has supplied; and I almost suspect that he has broken off his citation in the middle of a sentence.

We are told, that there are now no remains of any zodiacs at Thebes. This is very possible, and yet it is extremely probable that such monuments might once have been found there. I have already had occasion to speak of the golden circle of Osymandias; and this circle appears

* This must be an error of the press for *متل*

to me to have been a zodiac, since Diodorus says that the rising and setting of the stars were there denoted κατὰ φύσιν, according to nature. This historian likewise indicates another representation of the constellations in the same edifice at Thebes:—ὁπηρεῖσθαι αὖ ἀντὶ τῶν κινήσεων ζώδια περὶ αὐτὴν ἐκκαίδεκα μονόλιθα, τὸν ἀρχαῖον τρόπον εἰργασμένα. Τὴν ὀριζήν τε πᾶσαν ἐπὶ πλάτος οὖν ἐν ὀργυῖαν ὑπάρχειν μονόλιθον ἀστέρων ἐν κυανῇ καταπεποικιλμένην. Here we see, that the roof was supported by colossal figures of animals, probably the zodiacal animals, instead of columns, and the blue ceiling was variegated with stars.

But while it may be reasonably thought that the Egyptians constructed a zodiac for themselves, it is more difficult to understand how this zodiac, with little alteration, came to be universally adopted in Asia. We may perhaps obviate this difficulty by the following considerations. *First*, Ham, as we have already observed, appears to have fixed his residence in Egypt soon after the deluge; and hence those of his descendants, who settled in Asia, would naturally bear a peculiar respect for the institutions of the Egyptians. *Secondly*, the principal leaders of the principal sects, among the descendants of Shem, being monotheists, held tsabaism in detestation, and would naturally endeavour to destroy all monuments of the symbolical worship of the stars. *Thirdly*, it follows that the descendants of Ham were those alone, among the civilised nations, who were likely to preserve the ancient zodiacal symbols; but the Egyptians appear to have taken the lead very early, among the idolatrous worshippers of the Hosts of Heaven.

The zodiac of Esneh confirms me in the belief, that the Egyptians constructed the zodiac anew, while *Leo* was still a solstitial constellation; for in that zodiac *Leo* is clearly represented as the last of the ascending signs. It is not however to be argued from this, that the whole sign is to be understood as ascending. On the contrary, I believe the greater part of it ~~was~~ descending when this zodiac was framed; but as the solstitial colure was in *Leo* at the time, it was classed with the ascending signs. I am even disposed to think, that some symbols were admitted into this zodiac, which belonged to a more ancient period, and which ought to have been excluded from it. I allude particularly to the figure of the *Sphinx*, which is placed between *Virgo* and *Leo*.

The Abbé de la Pluche gives the following explanation of this symbol: “ Cette figure étoit composée d’une tête de jeune fille, et du corps d’un lion couché : ce qui signifioit qu’il falloit s’attendre à demeurer oisif sur les terrains relevés tant que l’inondation durerait—savoir, tout le tems que le Soleil mettroit à parcourir les signes du Lion et de la Vierge.—Ce qui achève de rendre cette explication certaine, c’est que le nom de Sphinx (שפנץ) ne signifie autre chose que *la surabondance*.” If the Abbé had consulted the Vulgate, he would have found that שפנץ is there rendered (Deut. xxxiii. v. 19. Ezek. xxvi. 10.) *inundatio*; and this meaning would have been still more favorable to the conjecture of the ingenious writer. This interpretation may however be disputed; but if instead of שפנץ *shephang* or *shphang*, the Abbé had taken the word שפנך *shephec*, or *shphec*, he would have been fully entitled to render it by *inundation*. But the word *Sphina* I conceive to be one of those hopeless Greek corruptions of foreign names, which must ever defy the skill of the etymologist. I can find no word in Coptic from which I can suppose it to be derived. To return to the Abbé’s explanation—I conceive him to be altogether mistaken, when he says, “ le Nil rentre dans ses bords sur la fin de Septembre,” that is, when the sun quits the sign of *Virgo*. The river begins to decrease at that period; but it does not entirely return to its natural level until the month of December. If the Sphinx had been intended to represent the repose, which was to be taken on the high grounds during the inundation, the symbol should have combined several signs instead of two. I can, however, see nothing in this symbol, which indicates that it had any thing to do with the Nile. In the Greek fables, which had originated with the Phœnicians, concerning the Sphinx, she is described as the daughter of Typhon and Echidna, whose bodies were human, but whose nether shapes degenerated into serpents. She herself had the head of a woman, the body of a dog, the tail of a serpent, the wings of a bird, and the claws of a lion. Most of these are added to the original figure; but we have here a re-union of the southern constellations, *Virgo*, *Canis Major*, *Hydra*, *Corvus*, and *Leo*. The Egyptian Sphinx is much more simple, and exhibits the head of a woman joined to the body of a lion. Now this symbol seems to indicate the period, when the Sun at the summer solstice was retrograding, owing to the precession of the equinoxes, out of the con-

stellation of Virgo into that of Leo. This supposes the symbol, not only to have been formed by the Antediluvians, but to have been formed at a period when a zodiac was already constructed. But the thing is not impossible. The symbol answers to the Sun's place at the summer solstice, in the year 730 after the creation, according to the chronology of the LXX. Seth (the great founder of antediluvian astronomy, according to the traditions of the Orientalists,) had then just accomplished one *Nex*, or cycle of 600 years. If then the *Nex* were known to the Antediluvians, as Josephus indicates, it was not unlikely that Seth should have marked his having attained the age of 600 years by the symbol before us. The Dog-star rose heliacally in Egypt about the time when the Sun at the summer solstice, 730 years after the creation, was passing between the signs of Leo and Virgo; and this again connects the symbol with Seth, since we have seen the Dog star was named both Soth and Seth by the Egyptians. I shall not, however, insist further upon this topic; though I must say, that if ever a symbol clearly told its origin, it is the astronomical Sphinx.

As I find Leo to be the last of the ascending signs in the zodiac of Esneh, I cannot avoid concluding, that a part of this sign at least was ascending when the plan of the zodiac before me was originally traced; and I cannot consequently assign to it a later date than 25 centuries before the Christian æra. From some circumstances, however, I am inclined to fix its date still earlier, —about 2800 years before our æra, and rather more than 300 years after the deluge according to the chronology of the LXX.

Of the three zodiacs before me, it is my intention to examine only that of the great temple of Dendera with particular attention. But before I do so, it will be better to detail my ideas of the manner in which the zodiac was originally constructed. My readers, however, must be aware, that I require from them two *data*:—*first*, that the constellations having been divided during the night, they were probably named and symbolised according to the season, when at the end of each month they rose in their order;—*secondly*, that as the zodiac was formed in a hot climate, allowances must be made for the time when the stars become apparent above the horizontal vapors. The remark of Bailli falls far short of the truth, when he says, “ Dans ces climats heureux, où le ciel est si serein, l'hor-

son est bordé d'épaisses vapeurs, et l'on ne voit les étoiles qu'à trois ou quatre degrés de hauteur.' There may be exceptions, but it rarely happens in Egypt that the stars are visible at this elevation.

1. Let us suppose then that the astronomers of Thebes, about 28 centuries before our æra, and 3 centuries after the deluge, according to the chronology of the LXX, undertook to construct a zodiac for Egypt. Let us also suppose that their astronomical year commenced at the vernal equinox. Employing the clepsydra as already indicated, and knowing the planetary road, they would observe, during a month before the equinox, the stars which appeared at night-fall above the eastern horizon, and which were either in the Sun's path, or bordered upon it. Owing to the horizontal vapors, they would not see the stars which were just risen, and they would of course make their reckoning from the upper part of this mist, as if it had been the real horizon. At the end of the month, and on the night of the vernal equinox, they would consider these stars as forming one constellation. But the Sun, at the period which we have mentioned, 2800 years before our æra, at the vernal equinox, set in the 5th degree of Taurus. Now, as I have noted from experience, that it is rare that a star even of the first magnitude, in hot climates, fairly emerges from the horizontal vapors, under an elevation of less than 10 degrees, the constellation, which would be visible at the time and situation we speak of, would be that which we call the Balance, and which the Egyptians appear to have always known by that name. Thus then comes, at last, my answer to M. Visconti. We find the Balance in its proper place, as a symbol of the equinox—not indeed of the autumnal, but of the vernal equinox.

2. During the next month the heat in the Upper Egypt rapidly augmented. The waters, which might have been left stagnant a few months before by the retreat of the Nile, emitted unwholesome vapors. The reign of Typhon, or of the hot pestilential wind, then really commenced; and the air became infected with mephitic exhalations, while the people began to suffer from those sultry blasts, which the Greeks called *ἐπνοὰς Τυφῶνος*. In this season, serpents, scorpions, and all venomous reptiles, were roused from the torpor in which they had remained during the winter.

The Egyptians designated the constellation, which followed *Libra*, and which appeared in the eastern division of the zodiac at close of day, by a scorpion. It is the Summer, and not the Winter, which is dreaded by the inhabitants of the Upper Egypt.

3. At the end of the succeeding month, the constellation, which was seen at night-fall above the horizontal mists in the eastern division of the zodiac, was symbolised by a centaur armed with a bow and arrow. The centaur was probably a very ancient hieroglyphic, denoting perhaps the Arab of the desert, who had tamed the wild horse, and who lived by the produce of the chase. *Sagittarius*, the symbol of the hunter mounted on his steed, or perhaps of the lawless robber of the wilderness, denotes, by the arrow with which he is armed, the piercing fervor of the solar rays.

1. The summer solstice having arrived, as the Sun was in the 6th degree of *Leo*, or perhaps the 7th, the Egyptians were now to symbolise the zodiacal constellation which had risen at night-fall above the eastern haze. The hieroglyphic chosen was a monster with the head of a goat and the tail of a fish. The goat represented the season when all animals on the banks of the Nile are obliged to follow the example of the goat, and to seek the high grounds. The fish intimated the approaching inundation of the river, which commences about the summer solstice.

5. When the Sun passed into the dodecatemoria of *Virgo*, the inundation was greatly increased. The zodiacal constellation, which was visible at close of day in the east, was represented by a man pouring forth water from two small vases. Did the Egyptians indicate by this, that the Nile arises from two small fountains, in the interior of Africa; but that joined by numerous streams it becomes a mighty river, and swoln by the copious rains, which fall in Ethiopia, annually inundates the valley of Egypt?

6. Two months after the summer solstice all the low grounds were inundated. The zodiacal constellation, which had risen with the night, was depicted by two fishes.

7. In a month afterwards, the constellation, which was visible at night-fall in the eastern division of the zodiac, was represented by a ram. This symbol probably belonged to the ancient zodiac; but it might have been retained by the Egyptians, as the emblem of the approaching

season, when the flocks might descend from the high grounds to pasture in the plains, for the inundation had begun already to diminish. Several reasons induce me to think, that the Egyptians in early times regarded Aries chiefly with respect to the time of its achronical rising in Autumn. Anoun, who presided over this constellation, was represented of a cerulean color, as if to indicate that he had sprung from the watery element, and that the inundation, though abated, had not ceased. Immediately under Aries is placed the constellation of the Whale; and before Aries arrives at the meridian in Autumn, the whole of the immense constellation of the River, from *Regel* to *Ateanar* (a corruption for *آخر نهر* • *Ichar nahar*, the termination of the River) is visible, probably at Thebes, certainly, I should think, at Philæ. I can have little doubt, that the constellations, called *Κῆτος* and *Ἰερίδανος* by the Greeks, were named the River-Horse and the Nile by the Egyptians, or else the Crocodile and the Nile. In the zodiac of Esneh, a crocodile is represented in the dodecatemoron of Scorpius. The crocodile, therefore, represents here the constellation variously called Cetus, Hippopotamos, Draco, Behemoth; and being placed near to Scorpius, denotes that when the Sun sets in this sign, the Whale has just risen in the east, under that part of the zodiac occupied by the Ram. Hence it seems evident, that the constellations of the Whale, and of the River, were thus designated in Autumn.

8. The Bull had been an ancient zodiacal symbol; and as the leader of the herd, might still be retained as the *Aleph* of the constellations. But the Egyptians were not the less attentive to the achronical rising of the sign. The Nile was now nearly reduced to its natural level. This was the season when the corn was to be sown; and oxen, as various authors report, were employed for the purpose of treading it into the soil. The bull was therefore a symbol which expressed the occupations of the Egyptians, at this season, for we know from Diodorus Siculus, that they sowed the corn in November; and as the Sun retired with the first degrees of Sagittarius, the stars of Taurus would appear at night-fall above the eastern haze.

9. We next come to the time when, the Sun being in Capricorn, the constellation, which was visible at night-fall in the eastern division of the zodiac, was that which we call the Twins, or Castor and Pollux. But the Egypt-

tians, as we learn from Herodotus, knew nothing of these Dioscuri. Accordingly in all the Egyptian zodiacs which are certainly genuine, the constellation in question is represented by a male and by a female figure. These figures are those of Osiris and Nephtys, of whose illicit and accidental commerce Anubis was the offspring.

I cannot help remarking here, that the astronomer at Thebes, who observed the heavens at this season, about an hour after sun-set, would find almost all the southern constellations represented by symbols, which might recall to him the history of that annual inundation of the river which was then nearly subsided. In the east he would observe Hydra, an emblem of the Nile, lifting its head above the horizontal mist. Farther to the south he would see the brilliant star of *Soth*, and he would remember that at the heliacal rising of this star the inundation had commenced. Already the helm of the ship, the constellation which the Greeks called Argo, but which the Egyptians knew only as the barge of Isis, followed Sirius; and the spectator would be aware that in another hour he would behold Canopus, usually represented by the figure of a vase or pitcher of water, far to the south, showing its luminous orb above the haze of evening. Directing his eye towards the meridian, he would recognise the River, the celestial Nile, with all its windings, extending 60 degrees from north to south, from the equator to the horizon. To the west of the meridian he would see the Whale, or the Hippopotamos, or the Behemoth, as it has been variously called, raising its head to the ecliptic under Aries, and spreading all its mighty bulk between the equator and the tropic of Capricorn. Then too he would see the River of Aquarius setting in the west; and his eye would naturally glance to the waters of the Nile, which were fast descending to their natural level.

10. At the conclusion of the following month, the Sun came to the winter solstice in Aquarius. The zodiacal constellation which then rose with the night above the eastern haze, was symbolised by a scarabeus. The season was that in which the Sun returns from the south. The astronomers of Egypt were aware, that the Sun is in the centre of our planetary system, and that it is by his attraction that the earth is preserved in its orbit. But the Sun's apparent motion being from east to west, while the Earth revolving on its axis really moves from west to east,

the Egyptians, as Clemens Alexandrinus tells us, symbolised the Sun by a beetle, when this animal having formed a round ball of dung, *rolls it backwards*—*ἀντιπρόσωπος κυλίνδει*. But as the beetle was said to move backwards in pushing the ball, it might very well serve to symbolise the season of the year, when the Sun brings round our globe again at the winter solstice, and when that luminary itself apparently retraces its course, and returns towards the northern signs (See also Horapollo.)

11. The Lion was probably one of the ancient zodiacal symbols. Horapollo and Macrobius have endeavoured to explain why this animal was chosen to denote the constellation which it represents. But the lion is not a native of Egypt; and it can hardly be imagined, that the Egyptians first placed this symbol in the zodiac. It seems to have been one of those which they retained.

12. We can hardly err in supposing, that the sign of Virgo was intended to symbolise the harvest season. In one ancient Egyptian zodiac this constellation is denoted by three ears of corn. Its brightest star is still called *Spica*. The Hebrews and Arabians named it *Shibboleth* and *Sanbulat*, which bear the same meaning. But in no country where we can suppose the zodiac to have been invented, could the harvest season ever have corresponded with the Sun's passage through the constellation of Virgo; unless indeed we adopt the system of Dupuis, and imagine the zodiac to have been constructed 16 or 17 thousand years ago.

According to the system which I have endeavoured to establish, this constellation ought to have been named and symbolised in Egypt, when it was seen at night-fall in the eastern division of the zodiac above the horizontal haze, and when the Sun, 2800 years before our era, set in the 5th degree of the constellation of Aries, one month before the vernal equinox.

But it will be said perhaps that, according to Diodorus Siculus, and other writers, the harvest in Egypt begins about the vernal equinox, and that consequently, when the Sun at the vernal equinox set in the 5th degree of Taurus, the constellation of Virgo at night-fall must have been already near the meridian at Thebes. Now this would be all true, if I spoke of the wheat-harvest, which begins in the Upper Egypt about the vernal equinox. But I have the authority of the sacred historian for saying, that the barley-harvest

in Egypt began at least a month before the wheat-harvest : —“ And the flax and the barley were smitten, for the barley was in the ear, and the flax was bolled ; but the wheat and the rye were not smitten, for they were not grown up.” (Exod. ix. 31, 32.) The words *כי אפילת הנה*, literally signify “ for these were dark.” But be this interpreted as it may, I think I am safe in stating, that the barley-harvest preceded the wheat-harvest by a month.

The zodiacal constellations, for which the Egyptians seem to have chosen new symbols, were probably those which we call Gemini, Cancer, Sagittarius, Capricornus, Aquarius, and Pisces—possibly also Libra and Virgo.

I shall now proceed to consider more particularly the oblong zodiac of Dendera. Although not so ancient, by a whole Sothic period, as that of Esneh, yet it is much more interesting in various respects.

The following extracts from the memoir of M. Visconti will enable the reader to form a general notion of this zodiac ; and after having perused them, he will, I trust, find no difficulty in following me through the details which I propose to lay before him.

“ Le grand zodiaque,” says M. Visconti, “ est distribué en deux bandes ; chacune d’elles est subdivisée en deux autres, l’une supérieure, l’autre inférieure. Dans la supérieure, qui est aussi la plus large, sont représentés des signes du zodiaque, au nombre de six, entremêlés de plusieurs figures symboliques, et d’une grande quantité de petites étoiles. Une suite de dix-neuf bateaux remplit la portion inférieure de la bande ; chacun de ces bateaux porte aussi une figure symbolique ; des cartels rectangulaires avec des inscriptions Egyptiennes accompagnent chaque figure.

“ L’autre grande bande contient les six catastérismes qui restent ; et au-dessous de ces catastérismes l’on voit dix-neuf autres bateaux avec des navigateurs semblables aux premiers.

“ Les signes du zodiaque sont disposés suivant leur ordre naturel de droite à gauche, conformément à l’usage de l’écriture Egyptienne ; mais la seconde bande se réunissant à la première, dans cette disposition connue dans la paléographie Grecque par le mot *boustrophedon*, les figures, pour ne pas varier l’ordre de droite à gauche, sont renver-

sées, et les bateaux au-dessous d'elles se touchent presque par leurs fonds.

“Deux grandes figures de femmes, et d'autres symboles, environnent les deux bandes, et forment le cadre de tout le zodiaque.”

In speaking of the circular zodiac, M. Visconti says, “La circonférence est occupée tout autour par trente-six figures symboliques, analogues à celles qui paroissent dans les bateaux au-dessous du grand zodiaque, et par leurs accessoires. Ces figures, à mon avis, ne sont autre chose que les trente-six décans, Génies qui président chacun à dix degrés du cercle zodiacal, assez connus par les anciens livres astologiques et par quelques rares monumens.

“Les deux bateaux qui surpassent ce nombre (36) dans le grand zodiaque, sont probablement relatifs aux jours épagomènes et à quelque Génie tutélaire de toute l'année. Un de ces deux bateaux précède les trente-six autres, et porte une Divinité à tête d'épervier ; le trente-huitième, qui en ferme la marche, est le seul qui soit monté par plusieurs figures.”

As I have endeavoured to show, that the great zodiac of Dendera was constructed at the beginning of a Sothic period, 1322 years before the Christian era, I shall begin my remarks upon it with examining the dodecatemoron of Cancer. We have already seen that this sign is indicated by two scarabæi, and that the division between them marks the Sun's place at the summer solstice, which place I have fixed for the 11th degree of Cancer according to the real zodiac. That the exact relative proportion between the two scarabæi should have been preserved by the artists, can hardly be expected. I ought to observe, that near Leo, two decans, and probably some figures, are entirely obliterated.

NOTICE OF

L. Annæi Senecæ Tragœdiarum Volumen primum, quod continet Herculem Furentem, Thyestem, et Phœnissas. Volumen secundum, quod continet Hippolytum, Œdipum, et Troades. Volumen tertium, quod continet Medeam, Agamemnonem, Herculem Œtæum. Quibus accedit incerti Auctoris Octavia. Penitus, excussis membranis Florentinis, adhibitisque Codice Ms. Ultraj., Editione prima Car. Fernandi, et aliis spectatæ fidei libris, item Jo. Fr. et Jac. Gronoviorum Notis ineditis, recognovit F. H. BOTHE, D. Phil. et AA. LL. M., Archiducali, quæ Jenæ est, Societati Latinæ, Berolinensiumque Teutonicæ, Hon. C. adscriptus. Lipsiæ, in Libraria Hahniana. 1819.

THE edition of Fernandus above alluded to appears to be very rare and curious, and is probably of great antiquity. The editor gives the following account of it in the preface:—"Cum Dan. Cajetani Cremonensis, Jodoci Badii Ascensii, et curatum ab Hieron. Avântio Aldinum pridem usurpassemus, editio Senecæ Tragici omnium, ni fallor, prima, quam, 'codice multo collato,' Lutetiæ Parisiorum, incerto anno, typis imprimi jussit Carolus Fernandus, commodata nobis est a politissimis bibliothecæ Desbillonianæ, quæ Manhemii servatur, custodibus." "Conspirat autem fere ista Car. Fernandi editio cum Herbipolensi, quam primam censebat Delrius, et Cajetani Veneta, nec multum a vulgo codicum abhorret, nisi quod nonnullis in locis et Florentinum ostendit scripturam, et propria quædam cum in verbis tum interpunctione habet, quæ scire interest eruditorum." And again in a note: "Hæc editio, Maittario, Deburio, et Panzero non visa, et in Gottingensis atque Heidelbergensis Academia-rum aliisque multis bibliothecis cum publicis tum privatis frustra quæsita, in auctione librorum Ducis De la Vallière 380 libris argenti Gallicis vendita est." This edition is not noticed in the *Index Editionum* prefixed to the Bipontine, where however one is alluded to, which seems to have been overlooked by our editor:—"Nos equidem cum aliis haud novimus priorem *Ferrariensi*, (1481), quam secuti sunt commentatores, Gellius Bernardinus Marmita 1482, et qui ei conjungi cœpit 1493, in Veneta

VOL. XXV. Cl. II. NO. XLIX. F

III., Dan. Cajetanus, Cremonensis." The editor has given the preface to this obscure edition, retaining its obsolete orthography and punctuation, a specimen of which we will present to our readers: "Atque ut liberrime quod sentio profiter, cogitanti mihi et sacratissimas caconicorum librorum hystorias: queque ex hiis monemur atque docemur memoria repetenti: denique hec ipsa cum diuis nostri senece carminibus conferenti: tantum fateor admirationis incuti solet: ut ea mihi meritis a nemine laudibus extolli posse videantur. quid enim mansuetissimus ille David atque ab omni arrogantia longe remotissimus paterni custos pecoris ad regiaque præter spem euectus fastigia? quid contra regali deiectus solio saul, tandemque miserabiliter interemptus ostendit? quid Job quoque, et gravissimo rei familiaris damno: et molestissimo afflictus morbo: tandemque et diuiciis et pristina restitutus sanitati demonstrat, nisi secundis prosperisque rebus non nimium esse confidendum? rursumque lapsis prorsusque afflictis meliora minime desperari debere: atque hoc ipsum gravissimus seneca noster hiis versibus admonet:

Nemo confidat nimium secundis.
Nemo desperet meliora lapsis.
Miscet hec illis prohibetque cloto
Stare fortunam. rotat omne fatum."

This rare edition closes with a poetical address to the reader, by Carolus Fernandus, the author of the preface, of which these are the two concluding verses:

Ite alacres igitur paucis ne parcite nummis:
Quando potest minimo maximus auctor emi.

To which is subjoined: "Impressum parisiis in vico clauso brunelli per Johannem ligman vuilhelmum præpositi et vulfangum hopyl socios."

The limits of this notice will not allow us to discuss the merits of the numerous emendations, which the learned editor has proposed and in many instances introduced into the text. On the *Hercules Cætus* we observe the following note: v. 48. "*Inde ad hunc orbem redi, Unde retro nemo.* Gron.: 'Flor.: *Unde omne retro est. Omne, τὸ πᾶν, universum.* A qua parte, quicquid est, retro et longe remotum est. Cui, quicquid est, ab tergo est. Pedito Albinovanus:

Jam pridem post terga diem solemque relictum,
Jam pridem notis extorres finibus orbis
Per non concessas audaces ire tenebras,
Hesperii metas extremaque littora mundi.'

Profecto sic legendum est, nec me movent inepti quidam, qui *omne* pro *omnia* dici negant. *Πάν* pro *πάντα* Æsch. Ag. 731. Soph. Trach. 71. Electr. 982. Pacuvius Dulorestes Rhetor. ad Herenn. Lib. 2.:

Sunt autem alii philosophi, qui contra Fortunam negent

Esse ullam, sed temeritatem omne autumant regere. Id magis

Veri simile ajunt, quod usus reapse experiundo edocet:

ubi libri: temeritate omnia autumant regi. Virgilius, si recte divino, Æn. 6, 33. quin protinus *omne* Perlegerent oculis, non *omnia*, quod a numeris abhorret. Statius Theb. 3, 626. Vobis ventura atque *omne*, quod ultra est, Pandere mœstus eo. Vulgata h. l. lectio ferri nullo modo potest, ne polita quidem ab Ascensio, qui dedit: *Nemo unde retro*: nam satis erat dici *Unde nemo*; τὸ *retro* putidum." In the passage from Virgil we do not consider the correction *omne* for *omnia* as necessary, it admissible; *omnia* is not more abhorrent from the versification than *aureis* Æth. 1. 726. and *aureo* elsewhere. In the present instance, the common reading *unde retro nemo* seems more consistent with the preceding words, *inde ad hunc orbem redi*, and with the vaunting language of Hercules, who certainly asserted something stronger in saying that he had made good a passage (in the words of Shakespeare) "from that undiscovered country, from whose bourn no traveller returns," than merely that he had come from a quarter, which was immensely distant. Exactly similar is the language of Hercules, in Herc. F. 609.

Noctis æternæ chaos,

Et nocte quiddam gravius, et tristes Deos,

Et fata vici; *morte contempta redi*.

The following passages are thus corrected by the ingenious editor, to whose notes we refer our readers for the grounds of the emendations:

Phœn. 22. Vel qua alta maria vertice immenso premit .

Minora (al. *Iuoa*) rupes, qua scelus fugiens ferum
(al. *suum*.)

Med. 719. Gravior horum pœna (al. *gravior pœna*) sedcat
conjugis socero mei.

Hippol. 830. Ut oia juveni paria pœrituro (al. *Pirithoo*,
gerit.

Ibid. 853. Auspicia (al. *hospitia*) digna prorsus inferno hos-
piti.

Herc. F. 753. In amne medio faucibus siccis senex
Sectatur undas: adluit (al. *abluit*) mentum
latex.

Herc. Clt. 102. Qua templa tollens ora (al. *ara*) Cenæ Jovis
Austro timendum spectat Euboicum mare.

Ibid. 1453. O cara (al. *clara*) Megare, tunc, cum furerem, mihi
Conjux fuisti?

Octav. 792. Reddere penates Claudiaë, di! vi (al. *Divi*)
parant.

Ibid. 783. Quicumque tectis excubat miles (al. *m. celsitat*)
ducis.

Æd. 56. Planctuque (al. *flutuque*) acerbo funera et questu
carent.

Agam. 54. Fugo (al. *fugio*) Thyestes inferos, Superos fugo.

Ibid. 906. Germane, vultus veste tutabor (al. *furabor*) tuos.

Phœn. 126. et Cadmi nemus

Serpente notum, sacra quo Dirce scatet (al. *latet*.)

Tro. 690. Quid agis? ruinâ pariter (al. *mater*) et gnatum et
virum

Prosternis una?

Med. 913. Ultimum agnosco scelus.

Anime, patrandum est! (al. *parandum*.)

Thyest. 406. Tractum (al. *tactum*) soli natalis et patrios deos.

Ibid. 1020. Exilia (al. *exitia*) supra nostra violentus fluat.

VECTIS INSULA PULCHERRIMA.

INDICTAS dum Vectis opes, et munera terræ
Expedio, parvisque placet dare rebus honorem,
Musa mihi dilecta fave! Seu culmine summo
Te Catharina tenet; puro seu rore nitentes
Humectas crines; venias in carmina præsens
Diva, precôr, facilisque tuo da numine vires.
Nostræ, grande decus, tutela o maxima, terræ,
Libertas, ades! atque audacibus annue cœptis!
Sive magis te, flava Ceres, juvat arva tueri,
Te! Dea, te tuæ regna vocant! tibi picta colores
Purpureos submittit humus! te Flora morantem
Increpat; et vârlis-invitat odoribus herba!
O largo sæcunda solo, gratissima tellus,
Quæ pulchrum Oceani mediis caput exseris undis:
Tu pelagi strepitus inter, nimbosque tremantes,
Immotam secunda tene in gurgite sedem.
Quid dicam ore prius? tibi num florentia primum
Prata canam, aut lætas segetes, portusve carinis
Confectos, aut quæ prætexant oppida litus?

At simul exoriens nitidus Sol lumine puro
Fulserit, et rebus dederit lux alma colorem ;
Sit mihi fas celeri pelagus decurrere cymba,
Inque tuos penetrare sinus, qua limite longo
Porrectum nemus horrenti prætenditur ora.
Contra respondens adverso ex litore Portus
Optatas aperit sedes, tutissima nautis
Hospitia ; hic æstu albescunt ante ostia fluctus,
Angustosque tenent aditus ; at utrinque reducta
Curvatur sinus intus aqua ; vacuumque procellis
In morem stagni placida mare sternitur unda. 20

Quinetiam stant armatas medio æquore naves
Conspicias, gentesque olim donitura superbas
Fulmina ferre utero ; circum munita patescunt
Mœnia, et educta ad nubes navalia tectis.
Tum si qua ardenti reboans dedit ore fragorem
Machina, turbatae procul audiit meola Vectis,
Territaque horrissono fremuerunt litora motu :

Haud secus intonnuere poli, quum sæviit ira
Ipse Deus—summa jaculatus fulgura ab arce
Dejecit, et nigro per cœlum turbine fertur. 40

Quam placido silet unda mari ! quam mollibus alis
Aura levis percurrit aquas, et marmora placat !
Fluctibus his saltem illæsas innare carinas
Crediderim : at quam vana fides ! quam blanda sereni
Arridet pelagi facies !—Hoc æquore quondam
Dum flatus posuere minas, religata catenis
Tuta diu navis steterat ; curisque soluti
Nautæ ipsi positæ carpebant gaudia mensæ :

Quum subito venti assurgunt, æstumque tumentem
Altius illidunt puppi ; (nam forte jacebat 50
In nudum demissa latus ;) correpta sub undis
Fertur in abruptum—volvuntur corpora ponto
Millia—Quid vos, o nautæ, evasisse tot hostes !
Quid toties superasse juvat ! non cura parentum
Vos patria condet terra, non ossa sepulcrum
Conteget. At quoties vobis tristissima fata
Multa gemens recolam, dolor imo e corde resurgens
Eliciet lacrymas, atque intima pectora tanget.

Quæ procul illa autem horrentes delubra per umbras
Conspicio ?—viden' ! ut fœdo stant obsita musco 60
Saxa suis avulsa locis ;—hæc limina quondam
Incoluit gens sacra virum, dum tecta manebant.
Illic simul ac fuscis agitabat in æthere currus

Sidereas nox picta faces, candentibus omnes
 Vestibus induti muros longo ordine circum
 Lustrabant taciti, manibusque incensa tenebant
 Lumina—Sed dispersa jacent jam saxa per herbas,
 Mœniaque obducit turpi squalore vetustas.
 Sæpius exercens feralis carmina bubo
 Per noctem lugubre canit; nemorumve tenebras 70
 Pervolitans late stidentibus insonat alis.
 Heu quam pauca manent priscæ vestigia sedis!

Digressio hinc paulum liceat mihi flectere cursus
 Circuitu longo, qua litoris ora recedit
 In medium conversa diem.—Quam gramine terra
 Hic vestita viret, variasque imitata figuras
 In tumulos assurgit humus, vel florida prata
 Explicat! hic passim sparguntur cicebra per herbas
 Tecta, humilesque casæ: densa superiminet umbra
 Congesta in murum moles, scopulique minaces 80
 Nituntur scopulis:—Ornos fruticesque virentes
 Acclivi pendere jugo, aut fastigia summa
 Scandentes hederas videas frondere corymbis,
 Et late erranti vincire cacumina nexu.
 Dura silex sæpe hybernis dejecta procellis
 Corruit in præceps; campumvolvuntur in imum
 Fragmina, concutiturque solum; tum maximus æther
 Mugit, et æquoreis fremitus redduntur ab antris.
 Hæc loca, nunc segetes, quondam (sic credidit ætas)
 Sub ponto latuere diu, cum visa repente 90
 Horrendo terræ motu maris unda referri
 Longius a ripis, et siccas linquere arenas.

Hinc me ducit iter, qua saxa rigentia cælo
 Consurgunt. Quali cautes se projicit umbra
 Desuper in pelagus! Quali candore cacumen
 In nubes abit, atque jugis horrescit acutis!
 Hic æstus fremit usque minax; latera ardua rupis
 Assidua pulsantur aqua; tum gurgite clauso
 Fit sonitus, spatiique immurmurat æquor iniquis.
 Hos non me quisquam fluctus tentare carina 100
 Suadeat, aut fragili vitam committere cymbæ:
 Namque ferunt opibus pressas, spoliisque superbas
 Huc cursum tenuisse rates, scopuloque latenti
 Illisas late oceanum stravisse ruinas.
 Quantos heu! patimur casus! quam dulcia nobis
 Gaudia miscentur lacrymis! heu quanta fatigat
 Cura homines, quantis fortunæ involvimur undis!

O quis me sistat sublimi in culmine montis !
Quisve tuo, Catharina, jugo ! patet unde jacentis
Prospectus pelagi, circumque innubilus æther 110
Lumine cœruleo purum dat cernere cœlum.
Quam virides redolent campi ! quam mollia prata
Vernus odor reficit ! Zephyri quam dulce susurrant
Per terram, et madidis permulcent aëra pennis !
At non tam pulchros ridens dat Enna colores,
Quum tu, cum sociis errans per amœna roseta,
Nympha, nimis dilecta Deo, te læta ferebas,
Signabantque impressa novi vestigia flores.
Haud procul hinc veneranda domus stat culmine summo,
Parva quidem, et multos dudum deserta per annos : 120
Hic olim vitiorum expers vir sanctus agebat
Innocuam ætatem ; cultus sine crimine simplex
Huic erat, et facili currebat tramite vita :
Sæpe haustas puris liquido de flumine palmis
Currentes captabat aquas ; matura levabant
Poma famem ; dulces ducebat cespite somnos,
Assiduisque Deum precibus votisque vocabat.
Hunc olim blanda nimium spe corda foventem
Durus amor miserum crudeli fraude sefellit ;
Mox flamma meliore calens, se sponte recepit 130
Ad collem, et parvam hanc fundavit vertice sedem.

Uterius jam flecte oculos, qua turris ad auras
Stat tuto defensa situ ; quondam inclita bello
Castella assurgunt saxis exstructa vetustis ;
Infra fossa patet ; circum fluvialibus undis
Mœnia cinguntur ; tum propugnacula muris
Aspicias, portisque affixa ingentia claustra.
Sed fortuna fuit ;—jam vix hærentia saxis
Saxa exstant, jam jamque solo lapsura videntur. 140
Tempore quo quondam tristes exercuit iras
Seditio, vulgique animos infanda fuentes
Arrexit ; pulsus solio, regnisque paternis,
Hic clausus latuit Carolus ; victusque dolore
Longa micante sinu ducens suspiria flevit
Civili Britonum sudantes sanguine campos.
Haud procul hinc pulchram Medina interluit urbem,
Et longos sinuat flexus ; camposque pererrans
In salsos fluctus tacito delabitur æstu.
Hic levis, atque illic fluvio delata secundo
Immatat alnus aquis ; spirans per carbasa ventus 150
Sibilat, et linter sine remige defluit alveo.

Quum Phoebus medium cursu conscenderit axem,
 Me juvat in gelida corpus deponere ripa,
 Murmur ubi raucos inter ciet unda lapillos.
 At magis occiduum quum sol descendat in æquor,
 Tum liceat spectare fretum, fluctusque micantes
 Sole percussos; totoque rubentia cœlo
 Nubila, quæ radios, et non sua lumina jactant.

Insula grata mihi, salve! tua prodiga tellus
 Quas varias effundit opes! tibi floribus horti 160
 Halantes; molli tibi stagna virentia musco;
 Non absunt liquidi fontes; procul exulat omnis
 Herba nocens campis, succique aconita maligni.
 Non ego Mænaliis, non quos habet India, campis
 Invideam; palmis liceat se jactet Idume;
 Thure Sabæus ager; quanquam pubescat Hymetti
 Perpetuo sub vere jugum, et melioribus annis:
 Hybla suas sibi pascat apes, et laude perenni
 Pulchra Tarentini memoretur gloria ruris:
 Te malim, dulcesque tuos habitare recessus, 170
 Inque tuo, Vectis, gremio captare quietem.

Blanda tuas mulcens sedes clementia cœli
 Rura fovet, faciesque nitet pulcherrima rerum.

Felices operum agricolæ! queis talia vitæ
 Gaudia contingunt! ultro queis' suave virentem
 Libertas tutatur humum; non sævit in agris
 Dira lues, longi nec spes intercipit anni.
 Aurea sic homini viguerunt sæcula quondam,
 Quum patrio contenta solo, modicisque laborum
 Fructibus, excoluit proprios gens pristina fines: 180
 Non mala luxuries prædulci imbuta veneno
 Solverat illecebris animos; non ardor habendi
 Impulerat ponti tractus tentare repostos.

Jamque vale, Vectis, quanquam dulcedine captus
 Usque tuos contempler agros, et amabile cœlum,
 Atque oculos pascens, tua litora circumspectem.
 At nunquam affulsero dies his lætius oris,
 Quam cum lassatus regno, et languore solutus
 Te, Vectis, latebrasque tuas, sedesque quietas
 Rex adiit, fugitque libens moderamina rerum. 190
 Salve, rex, nobis! salve, pater optime gentis!
 Te, quascunque urbes, quoscunque invisere fines
 Digneris, te voce una tua regna salutant
 Angliacæ dominum terræ, Vectisque potentem.

CRITICISMS ON

Some passages in HAKLUYT's Collection of the early Voyages, Travels, and Discoveries of the English Nation.—London Edition, published in 1809, 1810, 1811, and 1812, in 5 vols. folio.

To point out and correct errors in a work so celebrated as the above, cannot be uninteresting to the inquisitive and learned reader; particularly when those errors are calculated to mislead and obstruct the discovery of Africa: a subject which now, more than ever, engages the attention of men of knowledge and understanding. Moreover, it is expedient, as our knowledge of the travelling language of that continent improves, to ascertain and exhibit the blunders that have been committed in this work, when the authors of the respective narratives have undertaken the elucidation of Arabic words and sentences. An elucidation of this nature is necessary also to prevent future African travellers from extracting sentences from this work, as specimens of the Arabic language.

Vol. ii. p. 323.—Of the Pilgrimage to Mekka, and of the city of Alexandria.

Under this title, in a description of the latter city, the author says, it hath three gates, the name of only one of which is given, which is next the sea, and is called Babelbar; but no explanation is given of this term, the correct orthography of which is, Bab el Bahar, which is an Arabic term, and designates this gate to be the gate of the sea, *Bab* the gate, *el Bahar* of the sea.

Vol. ii. p. 323.—Mesquitos or Turkish temples: by this term is unquestionably meant Mosques, called by the Muhamedans Jumâa, i. e. Congregations, from the Arabic word *jma*, to collect, to congregate.

Vol. ii. p. 324.—Within the city of Alexandria are five Fontechi: these Fontechi, which is the Italian orthography for what we call Fundak, and which are so called by the Arabs, are a kind of Caravanseras, where merchants and traders come and deposit their merchandise for sale; a kind of Bassar, or public market, affording accommodation also to the owner of the goods, each proprietor having one room or more, according to his necessity or

convenience, which he hires at so much per week each room, providing himself with food.

Vol. ii. p. 325.—Speaking of the hospitals our author says, “The first is called Morastans, that is to say, the hospital which was founded by the king of Damascus, who having conquered Cairo, gave the city up to the sword for the space of five days, and, to obtain remission of his sins thus committed, caused this hospital to be built and endowed.” But this application of the term is incorrect; for Murstau, which is the correct way of writing the word for an English reader, (and which the Italians Italianise by writing it Morastano,) in the Arabian tongue signifies a Bedlam or mad-house; and this king, on reflection, thinking himself mad for having suffered such a wanton slaughter, caused this asylum to be erected for all lunatics like himself. The second is called Nessisa, from the name of the founder. The third is called Zavvia, which should be Zawia, as there is not the letter *v* in the Arabic language, and it is spelt with a *w*, and signifies the sanctuary of Imacheri. The fourth is called Imam Sciafy, which appears to mean Hammam Siafi, i. e. the bath of the vicegerent of some king or Khalif. The fifth is called Giamalazar, which we should write Jammaalazar, the church mosque or congregation of Lazarus.

Vol. ii. p. 328.—The captain of the mokka caravan is called, as our author informs us, Amarilla Haggi, which is evidently a corruption of *Amar illah el Hâje*, i. e. the director of the caravan by the decree of God.

Chisua Talnabi undoubtedly means, *El Kissua m'ta Innaby*, i. e. the garment of the prophet, (Muhammed,) the word *innaby* being applied to him only. The conductor or captain of the caravan is called *Sheikh*, and the *locum tenens* of the Sheikh is the *Emir Esssheikh*, not *amir el cheggi*, which is the Italian orthography, and which, when pronounced by an Englishman, loses its identity.

Vol. ii. p. 331.—“The realm of Serifo, the king of Mekka.” It here appears that Serifo is the name of the king, but it is not so, the word *sherrif*, which is the English way of writing the word, called by the Italians *serifo*, is the Arabic denomination for prince, and signifies the prince of Mekka.

The writer of this critique has often, during his residence as consul at Santa Cruz, heard the natives of Suse declare that the sugar-cane grew in the neighbourhood of Terodant,

and that it had been cultivated from time immemorial; a clear proof that it was known in this country before the discovery of America by Columbus, which the following passage in Hakluyt's Voyages, Vol. ii. p. 463, appears in some measure to confirm: "The Lion, of London, of which vessel Thomas Windham was captain and part owner, took on board at Santa Cruz sundry chests of sugar and molasses, of the former of which she landed 70 chests at the Canary Islands."

Vol. ii. p. 604.—The Emperor of Marocco's letter to Queen Elizabeth is as follows, A.D. 1585. "In the name of the pitiful and merciful God, &c. The servant of the supreme God, the conqueror in his cause, the successor advanced by God, the Emperor of the Moors, the son of the Emperor, the Shariff, the Haany, whose honor God long encrease and advance his estate. This our princely commandment is delivered," &c.

This letter is testified by Abdrahaman El Kâtan.

It is impossible to ascertain the true interpretation of this letter without the Arabic original; but it is evident that the following part of the translation is barbarous and incorrect. "The Emperor of the Moors, the son of the Emperor, the Shariff, the Haceni." The titles of the Emperor are well known, therefore the original must necessarily have been as follows: Sultan el Muselmen, Sultan ben Sultan, Shariff el Hassenny, which literally translated signifies, "*Sultan of the Muhamedans, and the son of a Sultan*, (not of the; Sultan being a title,) *prince of the house or dynasty of Hassen.*"

Vol. ii. p. 604.—The Emperor of Marocco's letter to the Earl Leicester, ambassador from Queen Elizabeth, runs thus: "The blessing of God light upon our lord and prophet Muhamed, and those that are obedient unto him.—The servant of God both mighty in war, and mightily exalted by the grace of God," Myra Momany, the son of Myra Momany, the Jariff, the Hazeni, whose kingdom God maintain, and advance his authority. Unto the right famous Earl," &c. &c.—From this version of the original Arabic, the reader would suppose that this Sultan, or servant of God mighty in war, was the son of Myra el Mumany; but this is a great mistake, for Myra el Mumany is a title Italianized from Emir el Mumany, and the original Arabic must have been thus written: "Emir el Mumany, ben emir el Mumany Sherif el Hassani," that

is to say, Conductor, leader, or commander of the faithful, (in Muhamed,) son of a conductor of the faithful, and prince of the house of Hassan. The same title applied to a descendant of this Emperor, will be found in the letter addressed by Muley Soliman, the present Emperor of Marocco, to our late revered Sovereign George III., for which see the original Arabic in the enlarged edition of Jackson's account of Marocco, &c. page 320, line 3 and 4.

Vol. iv. p. 557. Medina Thalhabi is a barbarous corruption of the Arabic words *Medina d' innebby*, i. e. the city of the prophet Muhamed, designating Medina in Arabia, where Muhamed was buried.

JAMES G. JACKSON.

We insert the following letters extracted from the above work, vol. iii. page 6 and 7, not doubting that the interesting intelligence which they contain will be an ample apology for their insertion.

"A brief relation concerning the state of the Cities and Provinces of Timbuctoo and Gago, written in Marocco, 1st August, 1594, and sent to Mr. Anthony Dassel, merchant, of London.

"My hearty commendations premised, your letter of late I received, and found that you would have me discover unto you the state and quality of the countries of Timbuctoo and Gago. And that you may not think I slumber in this action wherein you would be truly and perfectly resolved, you shall understand that not ten days past, here came a Cahaia of the Andoluzes home from Gago, and another principal Moor, whom the King sent hither at the first with Alkaid Hamed, and they brought with them 30 mules laden with gold. I saw the same come into the Alkasseba, (i. e. the Castle, or Citadel,) with my own eyes; and these men themselves came not poor, but with such wealth, that they came away without the king's commandment; and for that cause the king will pay them no wages for the time they have been there. On the other side, they dare not ask the king for any wages. And when Alkaid Hamed saw that the Cahaia of the Andoluzes would not stay in Gago with him, he thought good to send these 30 mules laden with gold by him, with letters of commendation, by which the king perceived the riches they brought with them; and this was the cause of the king's

¹ In the 17th year of the reign of Muley Abdelmuluk, commonly called Muley Moluk.

displeasure towards them. So now there remaineth in Gago Alkaid Hamed, and Alkaid Jawdra, and Alkaid Buckthar. And here are in readiness to depart the end of this next September, Alkaid Monsor, Benabdrahaman Allis, Monsor Rico, with 5000 men, with fire-match and muskets. There is gone good store of reds and yellows,¹ and this year here was sent of the same commodity; but I trust the next year there will be no want. But, in fine, the king doth prosper well in those parts; and here are many pledges come hither, and namely, three of the king of Gago's sons, and the Justice. I saw them come in with the treasure; and Alkaid Monsor is to keep Gago until the king take further order: and thus much for Gago. Thus, not having any other thing to write at present, I commend you to the merciful tuition of the Almighty. From Marocco, 1st August, 1594. Your assured friend,

“LAURENCE MADOC.”

“Another brief relation concerning the late conquest and the exceeding great riches of the Cities and Provinces of Timbuctoo and Gago, written from Marocco, 30th August, 1594, to the same Mr. Anthony Dassel, merchant, London.

“Loving friend, M. Dassel. Two of your letters I have received, one by the ship called the Amity, the other by the Concord: the chiefest matter therein was to be satisfied of the King of Marocco's proceedings in Guinea. Therefore these are to let you understand, that there went with Alkaid Hamed for those parts 1700 men, who passing over the sands perished, one third, for want of water; and at their coming to the city of Timbuctoo, the negroes made some resistance, but to small purpose, for they had no defence but with their lances and javelins poisoned. So they took it, and proceeded to the city of Gago, where the negroes were in number infinite, and meant to stand to the uttermost for their country. But the Moors slew them so fast, that they were fain to yield, and to pay tribute by the year. The tribute of Timbuctoo is 60 quintals of gold by the year; the goodness whereof you know. What rent Gago will yield you shall know next spring, for then Alkaid Hamed will come home. The tribute of Timbuctoo is come by the Caffela, or Caravan, which is, as above mentioned, 60 quintals. The report is, that Mahomed bringeth

¹ i. e. Yorkshire cloths, red and yellow.

with him such an infinite treasure as I never heard of: it doth appear that they have more gold than any other part of the world beside.

"The Alkaid winneth all the country where he goeth, without fighting; and is going down towards the sea-coast. The king of Marocco is like to be the greatest prince in the world for money, if he keep this country. But I make account, as soon as the king of Spain hath quietness in Christendom, he will thrust him out, for that the king's force is not great as yet, *but* he meaneth to be stronger.¹ There is a camp ready to go now with a viceroy; the speech is, with 3000 men, but I think they will be hardly 2000; for by report 3000 are enough to conquer all the country, for they have no defence of importance against an enemy. I think Hamed will return home in January, or thereabout, for he stayeth but for the coming of the viceroy. Muley Bel Hassan, the King of Marocco's son, was slain in Guinea by his own men; and they were presently killed, because they should tell no tales. And thus, leaving to trouble you, I commit you to God, who prosper you in all your proceedings. Yours to command for ever,

"LAURENCE MADOC."

NOTICE OF

The LIFE OF WILLIAM SANCROFT, Archbishop of Canterbury; compiled principally from original and scarce documents. With an Appendix, containing Fur Prædestinatus, Modern Policies, and three Sermons by Archbishop Sancroft. Also, a Life of the learned Henry Wharton; and two Letters of Dr. Sanderson, now first published from the Archbishopal Library at Lambeth Palace. By GEORGE D'OYLY, D. D. F. R. S. In Two Vols. 8vo.

PART II.—[Concluded from No. XLVIII. p. 359.]

"DIE 12.—Schedas aliquot Historiæ Literariæ mihi misit Dr. Cave, ut nonnulla, quæ mihi e re visa fuerunt, adderem, rogans. Literas ad eum remisi, quibus, ut promissam formulam literis

¹ A patent was granted, for 10 years, to Mr. Thomas Gregory and others, to trade between the river Nune and the river Madrabumba and Sierra Leone, by Queen Elizabeth, in the 34th year of her reign, A. D. 1592½.

statim mandaret, conditionibus prædictis nequaquam mutatis, postulavi. Rem ab illo petitam, diem totum operi impendens, confeci. Tandem, sera nocte, literas ab illo accepi, quibus, ut labori parcerem, postulavit; se enim conditionibus istis nequaquam assentire posse, mecum tamen ea de re quam libentissime coram acturum esse.

“Die itaque 13, cum Islingtonæ revisi; formulam ab eo conscriptam perlegi, verum approbare neutiquam volui. Præter encomium enim magnificum, longe supra meritum, certe præter votum meum, nihil aliud continebat, quam me sibi in opere concinnando multifariam suppetias tulisse, præcipue vero in conscribendis Pontificum vitis insudasse, majorique diligentia in postremis duobus sæculis usum esse. Rejecta formula, diu altercati sumus; ille sese opus nunquam editurum esse præ se tulit; jamque typographis inducias dederat. Ipse rem haud ægre ferre simulavi, schedasque omnes a me, illo absente, conscriptas repetii; ræque, siquando opus ederetur, dimidiatum tituli honorem expectare obtestatus sum. Schedas ille reddere detrectavit, multasque iniecit remoras. Memet vero acrius repetente, totumque salarium mihi ab illo, dum scriberentur, datum repetere pollicito, medelam causæ aliquam sibi excogitandam sensit. Primo itaque mihi dimidium, quod a bibliopola stipulatus erat, operis pretium dare obtulit, modo formulam ab illo conscriptam acciperem. Cum vero illud indignabundus respuerem, nonnullam tamen causæ meæ jacturam facere haud gravarer; tandem istiusmodi conditionem proposuit, ut ipse nonnisi 13 priora sæcula sub nomine suo evulgaret, ut auxilium meum in concinnanda istorum sæculorum historia, eadem usus formula, agnoscereb; ut tria sequentia sæcula sub unico mei nomine ederentur, titulo appendicis, ut sæcula ista mihi statim in manus consignarentur, pro libitu augenda, mutanda, vel rescanda, ac bibliopolæ pro arbitrio vendenda. His conditionibus tandem assensi; schedas accepi ac mecum domum retuli. Unica tamen pacto inerat difficultas, quod ipse partem sæculi 13 ipso absente conscripseram. Eam ille a me petere non erubuit, ipseque petenti elargitus sum. Cæterum notari mereatur, illum in isto colloquio et longe majorem operis partem a me scriptam esse, et dimidiatum tituli honorem a se olim promissum esse agnovisse; se vero in promittendo nihil aliud quam quale formula prædicta præ se tulit, voluisse, Deum testem adhibuit; quasi vero promissa ex intentione promittentis, non ex vi verborum æstimanda sint. Quod ad prius vero attinet, memet omnia sponte, non mandato ejus, conscripsisse allegavit;

quasi demum omnes authores libros sponte sua non conscriberent."

"Decembris 11. Abiectis regni insignibus, ipse Rex sese in fugam dedit. Periit cum eo Pontificiorum spes omnis. Faxit Deus ut malefactorum hominum istiusmodi ambitio atque impotentia nunquam Angliam iterum lacestat, ut tandem Ecclesiæ ab inimicorum insidiis liberatæ respirare et refluere liceat.

"Die 16. Rex urbem deductus est, ubi, cum more solito perditissimorum Pontificiorum e latebris ad adventum ejus erumpentium satellitum acciret, iisque solis aurem præberet, exclusis cordatoribus viris, Pontificiosque dimittere præfracte recusaret, Princeps Auriacus, proceresque regni, illi urbe cedendum esse denuntiarunt, et Belgarum turma stipatum Rocestriam deduci curarunt die 18°.

"1689. Jan. 6. Usserii specimen historiæ controversiarum, quod olim, hortante Archiepiscopo, descripseram, illique in manus consignaram, ab illo repeti, ut opus inceptum concinnarem, disponerem, augerem, et prælo appararem. Huic provinciæ ad medium usque Martii mensis sedulo incubui, cum tandem feliciter absolvi.

"Die 20. Historia Literaria evulgata est. Pro appendice mea recepi a Richardo Chiswell bibliopola triginta libras.

"Febr. 13. Gulielmus Princeps Auriacus et Maria uxor, Rex et Regina Angliæ ex solemnī Ordinum decreto proclamati sunt. Rem Archiepiscopus nequiquam probavit, atque adeo neque principes ab adventu suo inviserat, neque Ordinum Conventui aderat. Aderant eo die in capella nostra duo Regiæ capellani, qui Archiepiscopum ab illa missi convenerant, ut benedictionem ejus Majestati suæ impetrarent. Archiepiscopo salutato, in capella manebant, observaturi, annon pro rege et regina preces faceremus. Ego met solus e capellanis domi aderam. Caute itaque agendum fuit, ne Archiepiscopo mea culpa male cederet. Illum igitur accessi, de re dubia rogaturus. Rem ille meo arbitrio tacite commisit; neque enim se mihi novum aliquid mandare velle dixit. Antea etiam preces pro libitu Capellani mutaverant sine ulla ejus jussione aut reprehensione. Idem itaque mihi met licere arbitratus, cuique salus Archiepiscopi cara erat, et firmum regibus, quoscunque Deus nobis præponeret, parendi propositum, pro Rege Gulielmo et Regina Maria Deum in precibus publicis interpellavi. Noctu me accersivit Archiepiscopus, et vehementer excandescens, edixit ut aut reges novos in precibus nominare ommitterem, aut a precibus in capella habendis cessarem. Hos enim, vivo Jacobo,

reges esse non posse contendebat. Id animi illi indiderant episcopi Norwicensis, Cicestrensis et Eliensis, pessimo Ecclesiæ fato. Hinc enim Archiepiscopus, cui facile fuisset res omnes pro lubitu statuere, omnem in republica auctoritatem usque adeo amisit, ut Ecclesia ipsius causa deinceps maxime periclitari cœperit.

Eodem tempore, dum in Cantia adhuc moras traherem, bibliopola propositiones quosdam pro vendendo primo Angliæ Sacræ volumine, quod prælo jam pene exierat, emisit, et in iis editoris nomen præfixit, addito officii, quod apud Archiepiscopum Cantuar. gerebat, nomine. Id quidem fecit, me plane invito, et sapius inlubente. Factum autem plurimis displicuit, qui eo animo factum esse credi voluerunt, ut Archiepiscopi titulus invita potestate regia defenderetur.

1691. Mart. 27. Sponte mihi obtulit Episcopus Assavensis se curaturum, ut regię Majestati a sacris ordinariis adsciscerer. Regina, cui res ejusmodi pro arbitrio *dispendas* (disponendas?) Rex commiserat, legem jamdiu statuerat, ut quicumque in capellanorum numerum adsciscendi essent, concionem prius coram se haberent, speciminis seu probationis gratia. Illam autem subire conditionem penitus recusavi. Regina itaque ab Episcopo rogata die 26 Aprilis conditionem mihi relaxavit, meque in capellanorum ordinem statim admitti jussit.

Id subodoratus Episcopus Sarisburiensis,¹ infensissimus patroni ejusque familiarium adversarius, reginam adiit, multisque calumniis me proscindens, ipsam a consilio revocavit. Summa accusationis huc rediit, me Majestati regię inimicum esse, de jure ipsius male sentire; sæpe querulas, nonnunquam etiam seditiosas, voces emisisse; nuper autem pro Archiepiscopo exauthorato in concione publica Deum interpellasse, ipsiusque nomen in propositionibus de primo Angliæ Sacræ volumine edendo posuisse. His calumniis regina, aliquantulum mota, Episcopo Assavensi dixit se inaudivisse me præjudicia mea nondum exuisse, adeoque se velle ut admissio mea differretur, donec sibi certiora constarent. Hoc auditò, Episcopus Assavensis Episcopi Sarisburiensis calumnias detexit, reginamque, ne se mendaciis abduci pateretur, exoravit. Illa Episcopum clementer audivit, nil autem respondit. Assavensis Sarisburiensem recta petiit, et coram novo Archiepiscopo aliisque eximiis personis illi mendacium et calumiam exprobrat.

Die 17^o Junii, aulam regiam adii. Episcopus Assavensis

¹ Dr. Burnet.

mihi die hesterno dixerat Reginam mihi maxime favere, atque etiam velle, ut ad manus ipsius osculandum accederem. Nolui tamen id obsequii clementissimæ Principi præstare, dum patronus aulæ invisus apud Lametham moraretur, ne huic parum gratus seu fidus viderer. Episcopum itaque Assavensem rogavi, ut me hac in re apud Reginam excusaret, quod et dextre effecit. Regina enim Episcopo confirmavit se Episcopi Sarum palinodiam accepisse, atque excusationem meam benigne accipere: jussitque ut, quam primum patronus Lambetha excederet, mecum ipsæ præsentem sisterem.

Die 3 Octobris. Historiam Reformationis Anglicanæ a Burneto scriptam evolvere cœpi, eo animo, ut defectus et errores ejus notarem, ac deinde evulgarem. Quod facere statui, tum ut niam ejus, qua in damnum Ecclesiæ abusus est, famam convellerem; tum ut Historiæ nostræ Ecclesiasticæ errores receptos posteris indicarem; tum ut animo meo multis ab eo injuriis irritato nonnihil indulgerem.

Die 13 Octobris, observationes meas scripto consignare incipi.

Die 13. Urbem ingressus, librum Thomæ Bennet bibliopolæ juveni imprimendum dedi, sub ficto Antonii Harmer nomine, silentium stipulatus.

1693. Die 6 Februarii. Censura seu castigatio historiæ Burneti prælo educta, publici juris facta est. Quamvis autem nomen alienum præ se ferret, omnes apud Londinum statim clamabant me authorem esse. Burnetus Episcopus confestim furere, debacchari, usque ad rabiem irasci. Amici ejus authorem condemnare vel parvi pendere opus præ se ferre. Alii e contra authorem et opus miris in cœlum latidibus extollere, partemque secundam votis ardentibus optare. Burnetus se responsionem editurum statim in se suscepit; idque patri meo forte obviis mihi renunciari præcepit. Mox tamen ab incepto destitit, et familiari meo M. Roberto Canon confiteri non erubuit, se de diluendis adversarii sui objectionibus prorsus desperare, neque id aggressurum, quamvis parte secunda, quam tantopere flagitare præ se tulit, edita provocaretur. Ne nihil tamen faceret, me apud Reginam ausi temerarii et Reformationis causæ injurii accusavit; editaque in lucem sub initium mensis sequentis epistola ad Episcopum Lichfeldensem prolixa, semet excusare, adversarium lacerare, utcunque conatus est.

29 October. Visits Archbishop Sancroft, then dying, who puts into his hands the papers relating to the history of Archbishop Laud.

21 November. Visits the Archbishop again. Me ad lectum suum accitum multis piissimis admonitionibus ac bene-

dictionibus, verbisque vere amantissimis, dimisit; utque post obitum suum reversus chartas reliquas (mihi utiles) excuterem, inventas interim auferrem, jussit. Noluit enim me extremis suis seu exequiis adesse; ista enim a presbytero quodam, qui juramentum Wilhelmo ac Mariæ regibus non præstiterat, curari voluit. Mæstus admodum recessi, ac nocte sequenti animam sanctissimam Archiepiscopus cælo reddidit. Quamprimum justa defuncto persoluta fuissent, nepotes ejus, supremi testamenti executores, per literas interpellavi, de excutiendo patroni chartaphylacio, et accipiendis, quæ mihi destinaverat, chartis. Illi vero, rei totius ignorantiam prætexentes, id primum concedere noluerunt; postea tamen, me vehementius expostulante, in id saltem consenserunt, ut omnes chartas atque instrumenta editioni historiæ Laudianæ necessaria, atque alia quædam pauca, acciperem. Quapropter, die 30 et 31 Januarii, Fresingfeldam profectus reliquas patroni chartas (immensam sane congeriem) pervolvi, multasque mihi utiles mecum abstuli.

Mensibus Decembri et Januario, perlegendæ historiæ Laudianæ, emendandæ, notisque ac observationibus augendæ, chartis ac monumentis necessariis instruendæ, his ordinæ digerendis, integro denique operi ad prælum adornando, incubui, quantum valetudinis infelicitis cura permisit.

1694, die 3 Martii. Historiam Laudianam Chiswello in manus tradidi, ejus cura atque sumtibus typis nitidis imprimendam. •

10 April. Settles in his house at Chartham.

25 June. Goes to Bath.

27 August. Returns to London from Bath, a little better in health. •

In October and November, spits blood.

Studia interim, fracta penitus valetudine, parum procedere poterant. Sumtis tamen in manus historiis, quas ante triennium scripseram, de Episcopis Londinensibus et Assavensibus eas revisi, et additionibus præclaris auxi. Nonnihil etiam in adornanda nova atque ampliore Historiæ de Cælibatu Cleri meæ editione præstiti.

Mense Novembri, educta jam prælo HISTORIA R. R. P. Willelmi Laud, Archiepiscopi Cant. et Martyris de persecutionibus suis, quam mense Martio superiore prælo commiseram,

• Mr. Wharton lived only to publish the first volume. The second volume was edited in the year 1700 by his father, the Reverend Edmund Wharton, to whom he bequeathed his papers.

100 *Observations on the Map of North Western*

publici juris facta est. Eo nomine 88 circiter (quas stipulatus fueram) libras a Ricardo Chiswell bibliopola recepi.

Die 9 Novembris, tricesimum ætatis annum complevi. Plures mihi annos Deus pro clementia sua indulgeat, pristinaque corporis sanitate restituta concedat ut in sui suæque Ecclesiæ honorem atque utilitatem vitam diutinam protraham.

Eodem die, Serenissimus Rex noster Willelmus, ex Hollandia mare transnavigans, apud Margate in Insula Thaneto appulit et Cantuariam adveniens in adibus Decanilibus pernottavit. Vesperis itaque, Canonicos Cantuarienses comitatus, regias deosculatus sum manus.

Here the Ms. diary concludes. A note at the end, in Dr. Birch's hand-writing, says, "Mr. Wharton died 5th March, 169 $\frac{1}{2}$."

Geographical Observations on the Map of North Western Africa, lately published at Paris, containing the Routes of Adams, Riley, Scott, and Cochelet, &c. By JAMES GREY JACKSON.

Carte d'une Partie de l'Afrique, dressée pour servir à l'intelligence du Voyage de Monsieur Cochelet, dans sa Narration du Naufrage du brick Français La Sophie, sur la Côte Occidentale d'Afrique, &c. Par le Chevalier Lapie, Géographe. Paris, 1821.

WE hail every improvement in Geography; and, when a map is drawn up with the care and diligence that appears to pervade this *Carte d'une partie de l'Afrique, &c.*, an essential service is rendered, not to France only, but to all the civilised world: but at the same time, that we feel our obligations to the Chevalier for this scientific Geographical elucidation, we feel it our duty, as there is still room for improvement, to point out some inaccuracies, which, if corrected in the copper-plate, would render this map still more perfect, and consequently more valuable, than it actually is. We therefore submit the following observations to the Chevalier Lapie himself, assuring him, at the same time, that our motive is to elucidate facts, and to improve the Geographical knowledge of that part of the world.¹

In LAT. N. 35°. LONG. W. 4° 35'. of this map, are the words *Kalaat el Ouad*. Now there is no such place as Kalaat el Ouad, neither is *Kalaat* an Arabic word, although it is inserted in the

¹ The Longitude in this map is calculated from that of Paris, which is 2° 25' east of London.

best English maps, as well as French. The words intended are *Kataat el Ouad*, which are Arabic words, and signify that there is a ferry or ford at that place.¹ The substitution of *Kalaat* for *Kataat* has originated, without doubt, through an error of the press.

LAT. N. 25° 20'. LONG. W. 15°. OUADLIMS. If this name were correct it would signify the river Lims, as Ouadnoun (in Lat. N. 28° 30'. Long. W. 12° 40'.) signifies the river of Noun; but the proper words are *Ouoled*, or *Woled Deleim*, i. e. the sons, children, or descendants of Delemy. The emigration from this tribe, in Lat. N. 24° 10' Long. W. 9°. should be also *Woled*, or, if written in a language not having in its alphabet the letter W, *Ouoled Deleim*. By calling this tribe² Ouadlins, the word becomes unintelligible, and loses its identity.

LAT. N. 26° 40'. LONG. W. 8° 40'. OUOLED ABRUSEBAH is an emigration from the tribe of that name, whose encampments occupy parts of the tract between Santa Cruz or Agadeer and Wednoun, and farther to the south there is an emigration from this tribe: it is also very likely that they have pitched their tents in Lat. N. 19'. Long. W. 15°, as marked in this map, and erroneously denominated *Labdessibas*; which unintelligible word ought to be expunged from all the maps of Africa. It is an European corruption of the words Oualed Abbrusebah; oualed, i. e. the sons, descendants or children of Abbrusebah. Vide this subject also discussed in the work alluded to in the note below. This tribe occupied the extensive plains near Marocco; and by their depredations on the caravans to and from that city, the Emperor of Marocco, Sidi Muhamed, the father of the present Emperor Soliman, repeatedly fined them for these depredations: he found them, however, incorrigible, and banished the whole tribe, giving information at the same time to the provinces in the south, through which they would pass in their passage to the Sahara, that they were outlawed, and might be plundered by any one that chose to attack them: many of them were accordingly killed and plundered during their progress to the south, at the period of their banishment.

LAT. N. 28°. LONG. W. 14°. MONSELMINES. This word appears also to have been originally an error of the press, and has been copied from one map to another; but it signifies Muselmene, i. e. Muhamedans or Moors, to distinguish them from the Bedoween Arabs on

¹ Would it not be better to expunge the Arabic words altogether, and make it intelligible to the European reader by calling it the ferry? The Muluwia river, where this ferry is found, is a very rapid mountain stream, wide, and very deep in the rainy season, but shallow in the summer, when it might possibly be crossed a-horseback.

² Vide this subject discussed in Mr. Jackson's letters to the late President of the Royal Society, inserted in the Proceedings of the African Association, (in two volumes, 8vo.)

their southern confines, whom they insinuate to be lax in their devotions, or not Muselmén like themselves.

LAT. N. 24°. LONG. W. 16°. EL GHIBLAH. I strongly suspect this to be, El Kiblah, for it is the situation of the country bearing that name. The word Ghiblah, if the G be pronounced soft, I never heard mentioned, although I have had much and frequent intercourse and conversation with Arabs, inhabitants of the Desert of Sahara, from Cape Noun to the Sahel of Senegal.

The Baubarras, laid down in this map North of Timbuctoo, I strongly suspect, are taken from the word *Brabeesh* in the map facing the title-page, in Shabeeny's Account of Timbuctoo, &c.; but whether it be or not, it is an error; for the Brabeesh are Bedoween Arabs, a race as distinct from the Brebbers or Baurbarras, as the English are from the Italians.

The introduction of the name *Bahar Tieb* in a map of Africa, is excusable only from a total ignorance of the Arabic language. See this subject fully explained in the New Monthly Magazine, March, 1821, page 356.

Timbuctoo is in this map called also Timectou.¹

More might be added on the geography of this part of Africa, of less consequence perhaps than the foregoing observations, and not interesting to the general reader; but if the Chevalier should happen to read these observations, and should think them deserving of notice in forming a map of Africa, I shall be very happy to communicate further information respecting the situation of some places of consequence which have been omitted in his map, which I have visited, and with the situation of which I am acquainted. In making this offer I have no other view but that of the improvement of the geography of this imperfectly known part of the world.

It is a very remarkable circumstance, that the crew of the French brig, *La Sophie*, which was wrecked in 1819 on the Western Coast of Africa, were detained in the most deplorable captivity longer than they would have been, from the unfortunate circumstance of their not knowing that the meaning of the word *Soueirah* is Mogodore; and the narrator aptly remarks, that a matter of such importance should be generally known, and that the word should be inserted in all maps hereafter published. No doubt the French will now insert it; but if Mr. Cochelet had seen Mr. Jackson's map of West Barbary, in his Account of Marocco, published so long

¹ The former is the Arabic name, the latter the Shelluh or Chelluh; and I have no hesitation in saying, that, if the letter or account referred to by the late Sir Joseph Banks in his note to Mr. Jackson, where it is called Timkitoo, (an extract of which is in the New Monthly Magazine for March last, p. 354,) is examined, it will be found that that letter or the intelligence contained in it, is derived or obtained from some Shelluh, and not from an Arab.

since as 1809, and now sold by Cadell and Davies, or if he had seen the same map in the Account of Timbuctoo, by Shabeeny, he would have known the signification of the word Soueirah, as well as of some other words, important to be known, and inserted by Mr. Jackson in that map, in the language of the country, for the express purpose of furnishing to wrecked mariners, on the Western Coast of Africa, that information which, it appears, was unknown, but which would have been valuable, to that unfortunate part of the crew of *La Sophie* that were in captivity among the Arabs of Sahara, and who suffered such intolerable and unheard-of hardships and incredible privations.

We are aware that this intelligence is unconnected with the foregoing geographical observations; but a matter of such importance to our brave mariners cannot, we conceive, be too generally known and diffused, through every possible channel of communication, particularly when we consider that, according to the interesting narrative of the shipwreck of *La Sophie*, this information is evidently calculated to shorten the captivity or slavery of such British subjects as may hereafter be so unfortunate as to be wrecked on the Western Coast of Africa.

ON THE LIFE AND WRITINGS OF CASIMIR.

MATTHIAS Casimir Sarbieuski, one of the most celebrated Latin poets of modern times, was descended of an illustrious family in Poland, and at the age of 17 (A. D. 1612) became one of the society of Jesuits; an order which, at that time, was particularly prolific in Latin versifiers. He was afterwards sent to Rome, on some mission relative to the affairs of the Polish Jesuits; a journey which he has celebrated in one of his minor poems, the *Iter Romanum*, perhaps suggested by Horace's journey to Brundisium, which seems to have been a favorite model for imitation with the Latin poets of that time. His stay in Italy appears to have been of considerable length. Some odes which he addressed to Urban VIII. procured him the patronage of that pontiff, who afterwards employed him in revising the church hymns for a new edition of the Roman Breviary; and when, previous to departing for his native country, he paid his valedictory visit to the holy Father, the latter, as he rose from performing the customary salutation, placed

a gold ring on his finger. During his sojourn in Italy he appears to have contracted an intimacy with many of the principal literati of that country; and from his ode, *Ad Amicos Belgas*, (Lib. iii. Od. xxix.) his acquaintance appears not to have been confined to the scholars of Italy. After his return to Poland he became successively professor of humanity, philosophy, and theology, at the university of Wilna, and took the degree of doctor at the same university, on which occasion the king, Ladislaus IV. or V. who presided at the ceremony, conferred on him the same distinguished honor which he had before received from Urban. He was afterwards appointed king's preacher, and became, from his conversational powers, an especial favorite with that prince. He is said; however, to have reprehended the vices of the monarch and his court with an unsparing severity; from which, and from the general tenor of his poetry, we are led to form a rather advantageous opinion of his private character. Except when summoned to attend the court, or accompany the sovereign in his journeys, he appears to have resided either on his hereditary estate, or at a seat belonging to the Jesuits of Wilna, till the period of his death, which happened in 1640, at the premature age of 45.¹

With his prose works, which were somewhat numerous, and (we believe) principally on theological subjects, we have no acquaintance. His poems consist of four books of odes, one of epodes, one of dithyrambics under the title of *Silviludia*, one of occasional poems, and one of epigrams. Besides these he left behind him the fragment of an epic in twelve books, on the foundation of the Polish monarchy, entitled the *Lechiad*. This however is lost; and if we may judge from the specimens of heroic verse occurring among his detached poems, its completion would have been no great acquisition to literature. His remaining poems, with the exception of his odes, contain little worth remembering; the *Silviludia* are fantastic without lightness, and savour too much of the ~~poet~~ poet laureate; his *Sylvæ* are heavy, and his epigrams, both religious and secular, for the most part without point. In one of them he thus puns upon the name

¹ The above particulars are given partly from the French Dictionnaire Historique, partly from intimations occurring in his own writings, and partly from our imperfect recollections of a memoir prefixed to the Bipont edition, and likewise, if we mistake not, to that of Barbou. The more concise account of the French writer is for the most part sufficiently accurate; "*L'Eschiade*," however, the name of Casimir's unfinished epic, ought to be read "*La Lechiade*."

of his patron, a Polish general of the name of Chodkiewicz:

* * * * *

Nil in te juris, Carole, casus habet.

* * * * *

Chodkevici . . . est indeclinabile nomen :

Robore bella geret; *casibus* ergo caret.

The odes of Casimir are of various classes ; panegyrical, heroic, moral, devotional, and descriptive. His panegyrics are addressed, partly, to Cardinal Barberini and his other Italian friends, partly to various Polish nobles and dignitaries, but chiefly to Urban VIII, on whom he lavishes more poetical tributes than Horace on Augustus of old, of whom he frequently reminds us. In one respect, indeed, the tenets of his religion warranted a higher flight of eulogistic ascription, than was allowed to the Roman.

Te Vaticanis Maurus et Æthiops

Affusus aris, te tepidi canunt

Devexa mundi, te remotæ

Littora personuere Chrysæ :¹

Magnusque late diceris arbiter

Cælumque, terrasque, et maria, et Sygga,

Annemque Cocyli severum, et

Elysium colubere Lethen.

Compare with this the “ Te minor latum reget æquus orbem,” and the “ O qua Sol habitabiles illustrat oras, maxime principum,” of Horace !—His heroic odes consist of invectives against the degeneracy of the age—commemorations of the military glories of his countrymen, and especially their victories over the Turks—and exhortations to a general crusade against those barbarians. This last is a favorite topic with him.

The subjects of these are in many instances obscure, and in themselves little interesting. The world no longer resounds with the praises of that once renowned champion, who, under the special patronage of the Virgin Mary, as the poet tells us,

Bis ter exegit gladium per omnem

Victor Auroram, tumidique fregit

Cornua Ponti.

Nor are we at present much interested in knowing that another “ boast of fame,” the chieftain of the adverse party,

¹ Japan.

Ille terrarum fragor, ille magnæ
 Fulmen Europæ, Scythici tremendus
 Arbiter ponti, piger obsoletis
 Accubat armis.

The charm of these compositions consists in the fire and spirit of the descriptions, the patriotic feeling which pervades them, and the grandeur of the sentiments with which they are interspersed. The devotional poems consist chiefly of hymns in honor of Christ and the Saints, and imitations of Scripture. The former bear a considerable resemblance to Horace's odes addressed to the heathen gods. "Huetius's ode to the Virgin Mary," says Gibbon, "might have been intended for Diana;" and a similar remark holds good with regard to the religious odes of Casimir. "O Diva clari gloria verticis," is the beginning of one addressed to Our Lady of Claremont. The same object of religious reverence is elsewhere termed "Diva terrarum pelagique præses." Again:

Reginam teneræ dicite virgines
 Visentem roseis astra jugalibus,
 Dignanturque volantum
 Currus flectere siderum.

* * * * *

Cæcos illa metus, et procerum graves
 Iras, e miseræ limine patriæ,
 Vestris mota querelis,
 Ad Medos aget et Getas.

Lib. ii. Od. xviii.

And St. Elizabeth is "Diva devexo dominata ponto." The resemblance has sometimes a most unfortunate effect, as in the following little ode "Ad D. Virginem Matrem, cum fame, bello, cœlique intemperie laboraret Polonia."

Aurei regina Maria cœli,
 Mæsiæ valles Hypanimque late
 Nubium curru super et nivosis
 Vlæ quadrigis.
 Aureus tecum puer, et coruscis
 Auræ pennis properent catervæ;
 Et Salus, et Pax, et aperta pando
 Copia cornu.

Lib. ii. Od. xxvi.

¹ Extract from his Common-place Book, in some part of his miscellaneous Works,

The resemblance, in point of externals, between ancient heathenism, and modern catholicism, as it exists in most professedly catholic countries, has not escaped observation; and it is probable that this similarity existed in a still greater degree at the time when Casimir wrote. That the exterior system of the Romish Church was to a great extent modelled on the institutions of Pagan Rome, is well known; and we have seen a passage cited from Polydore Virgil, in which this imitation is justified on the plea, that it is good policy to beat the devil with his own weapons; a maxim which may be considered as anticipating the well-known apophthegm of a modern methodist divine. Another peculiarity of the Romish devotional writers, and which is common to them with the methodists, consists in the extraordinary liberties which are not unfrequently taken with the most sacred names and persons of religion. We shall not quote any instance of this familiarity, but content ourselves with referring to Lib. iv. Od. xxv. and Epod. xii. of our author, in the former of which (according to a frequent practice of the Catholic poets of those times) he introduces the Virgin Mary and the infant Jesus as carrying on a dialogue of mutual panegyric.—To this class may also be referred his paraphrases of the Song of Solomon, which retain a greater portion than might be expected of the descriptive beauty of the original.—His moral odes are sometimes, like the “*Odi profanum vulgus*” of Horace, *carmina satura* (if the expression may be allowed), collections of maxims on different subjects; others are more confined as to matter. In the enunciation of moral truth he is always at home; and it is in this department, perhaps, that he approaches nearest to Horace. Owing, however, partly to his familiarity with Seneca and Lucan, and partly to the superiority of the Christian ethics, he assumes a higher tone of sentiment than his master; and it is this part of his writings which especially calls forth the encomiums of a kindred spirit, the excellent Dr. Watts, (himself not without a portion of poetical talent) among whose Lyrics many translations and imitations of Casimir¹ occur. His descriptive odes are few in number, and generally short.

The principal characteristics of Casimir's poetry are ease, brilliancy, animation of style, and copiousness of

¹ A volume of translations from Casimir was lately published, or advertised as in the press. We have not however met with it.

imagery and diction. We shall not perhaps be thought fanciful if we say, that there appears to us something *national* in his genius. The Poles are, as well by character as by local situation, half Asiatics. Their national temperament, as we have heard it described, appears to resemble that of another people considered by some as of oriental extraction—the Irish. They are simple, credulous, affectionate, and enthusiastic; and these qualities (which are themselves naturally connected with an imperfect state of civilisation) are uniformly productive of a corresponding intellectual character. The warmth of manner, the exuberance of imagery, and the imperfection of taste which have been so often noticed in the poets and orators of Ireland, are equally conspicuous in the writings of the only Polish poet whose reputation has as yet travelled beyond the boundaries of his country. Born on the confines of Asia, yet himself deeply versed in the poets of ancient Rome, and familiar, during his residence in Italy, with the best Latin writers of that period, he in his works exhibits a singular combination of Roman stateliness and elegance with oriental profusion and extravagance of fancy. It is impossible to imagine either the same irrepressible luxuriance, or the same wildness of metaphor, in an Italian writer of that period. Whatever be the subject, he has a stock of ideas ready for the occasion; and even these are often enveloped and lost amidst a cloud of gaudy words. Where there are no beauties of form or gesture to attract us, he dazzles us with the wide sweep of his voluminous and gorgeous train. This copiousness of diction and illustration places him in very advantageous contrast with the inditers¹ of modern Latin lyrics. One of his excellencies indeed consists in his power of adapting modern thoughts to ancient language; an art in which they are

¹ Our words must of course be taken *cum grano salis*. The taste of the age, however, is decidedly unfavorable to the publication of Latin poetry; and from this circumstance, as well as from some observations which we have heard from an eminent scholar on this subject, we are inclined to think that the best specimens of the kind exist, for the most part, in manuscript.—We have just obtained a sight of a small volume with the following title: “*Idyllia Heroica Decem, Librum Phaleuciorum unum, partim jam primo partim iterum atque tertio edit Savagius Landor. Accedit Quæstioncula cur Poetæ Latini recentiores minus legantur. Pisis apud S. Nistriū mccccxx.*” From our cursory inspection of the volume, and from the character of the author, we are inclined to augur highly of its contents. We hope to be able to give our readers some account of these poems in a future number.

grossly deficient. Casimir writes with the perfect freedom and self-possession of one who is composing in his own language. We know not how far this facility is to be ascribed to his extraordinary intimacy with the old Latin poets. He is said to have read Virgil sixty times, Horace thirty-two, and the others in proportion :—perhaps (as in a parallel instance with which we are acquainted) with the purpose of imbuing his mind thoroughly with the phraseology, sentiments, and metrical flow of the original writers. The practice was certainly, in both cases, attended with the desired result ; it is not, however, one which we should in general recommend, unless at considerable intervals, as it has a tendency to deaden our perception of the beauties of the original.—We must however reserve our further remarks on the diction, metre, and general character of his poetry, together with our observations on individual poems, to a future number ; requesting only permission to confirm some of the opinions expressed in the above critique by the authority of one, who, being himself almost unrivalled both as a critic and a poet, has a claim to more than ordinary attention on a question of poetical criticism. We allude to a passage in the second volume of S. T. Coleridge's *Biographia Literaria*, p. 297 ; in which, after explaining, with characteristic perspicuity, the alleviation which is derived to our sorrows from the sympathy of friends, on the principle that “ all confusion is painful,” and that, by the very act of expressing one affliction in words, we are compelled to place it before our own eyes in a more definite and tangible form, he proceeds to say—“ Casimir, in the fifth ode of his third book, has happily expressed this thought.” He then quotes part of the ode cited by us in the present number of the *Miscellanea Classica*, and adds as follows in a note, the whole of which we extract, on account of its brevity.

“ *Classically* too, as far as consists with the allegorising fancy of the modern [poetry], that still *striving to project* the inward, contradistinguishes itself from the seeming ease with which the poetry of the ancients *reflects* the world without. Casimir affords, perhaps, the most striking instance of this characteristic difference.—For his *style* and *diction* are really classical : while Cowley, who resembles Casimir in many respects, completely barbarises his *Latinity*, and even his metre, by the heterogeneous nature of his thoughts. That Dr. Johnson should have passed a

contrary judgment, and have even preferred Cowley's Latin poems to Milton's, is a caprice that has, if I mistake not, excited the surprise of all scholars.¹ I was much amused last summer with the laughable *affright*, with which an Italian poet perused a page of Cowley's *Davideis*," (Mr. C. means Cowley's own translation of the first book, which fully justifies his criticism) contrasted with the enthusiasm with which he first ran through, and then read aloud, Milton's *Mansus* and *Ad Patrem*.

CÆCILIVS METELLVS.

As we have alluded to the quotation from Casimir given in the *Miscellanea Clásica*, and to which a parallel was cited from Sir Thomas Browne, we shall subjoin a passage of Jeremy Taylor, which fell under our eyes shortly after the *Miscellanea* were sent to press.

"Every man rejoices twice, when he hath a partner of his joy. A friend shares my sorrow, and makes it but a moiety; but he swells my joy, and makes it double. For so two channels divide the river, and lessen it into rivulets, and make it fordable, and apt to be drunk up at the first revels of the Sirian star; but two torches do not divide, but increase the flame; and though my tears are the sooner dried up when they run upon my friend's cheeks in the furrows of compassion; yet, when *my* flame hath kindled his lamp, we unite the glories, and make them radiant, like the golden candlesticks that burn before the throne of God, because they shine by numbers, by unions, and confederations of light and joy." *Sermons*, Vol. ii. p. 474, ed. 1817.

EPIGRAMMATA, EPITAPHIA VARIORUM.

In Alexandrum Magnum.

Sufficit huic tumulus, cui non suffecerat orbis :

Res brevis huic ampla est, cui fuit ampla brevis.

¹ Mr. Landor, in his Latin essay, passes a severe sentence on Cowley. "Culæi quidem accuratius conservanda sunt tam Latina, tam Britannica; omnia enim, quæ oportet evitare, complectuntur."

In Mendacem.

Mendacem semper memorem decet esse ; sed, ohe !
Tu plus mentiris, quam memor esse potes.

In Calvum.

Debetur canis reverentia sancta capillis :
Debetur capiti, calve, quid ergo tuo ?

In quendam, qui se ante mortem sepelierat.

Pauperie et senio confectus, nullus egeno
Et mendicanti quum mihi ferret opem ;
Membra tremens, sensim tumulum proclivis adivi,
Ut vitæ finem sic facerem miseræ.
Per me mutatus morientum præscus erit mos :
Venit post tumulum mors mihi sera meum.

Ad Maurum.

Maure, tuas jacet ante fores, et supplicat hostis :
Pœnarum, ulcisci posse, sat esse puta.

In Pompeios.

Magne, premis Libyam ; fortes, tua pignora, nati
Europam atque Asiam : nomina quanta jacent !

Male parta male dilabuntur.

Milvū edax, nimis quem nausea torserat escæ,
Hei mea, mater, ait, viscera ab ore fluunt.
Illa autem, quid fles ? cur hæc tua viscera credas,
Qui raptō vivens, sola aliena vomis ?

In Cæsarem.

Gloria vincendi juncta est cum milite, Cæsar ;
Cæsar, parcendi gloria sola tua est.

Philomelæ partus.

Felix, populea quæ factum enixa sub umbra,
Dulce sonas vario gutture carmen, avis.
Implumes natos blando Tithonia risu
Aspicit, et liquidi munere roris alit.
Insomnes agitat nidos, lenique susurro
Næniolam pullis accinit aura tuis.

Nobilis non nobilis.

Me pater obscuram, claram me finxit Apelles,
Hæc mihi nobilitas post mea fata venit.
Plus mihi quam genitor benefecit pictor, et atra
Mors mihi plus lucis quam mea vita dedit.

Sitiente exercitu oblatam aquam respuit Cato.

Africa belligeros amburit arena Quirites,
 Nullaque jam querulæ subvenit unda siti.
 Forte breves galea legit udo e pumice lymphas,
 Demeruitque levi munere lixa ducem.
 Delicias oculo spectans sitiente phalanges,
 De nihilo princeps invidiosus erat.
 At Cato, defectis quanquam trahit ilia venis,
 Attonito intactas agmine fudit aquas.
 Principis exemplo dolet ægrum mitius agmen,
 Nulla sium culpat, nulla querela ducem.
 Augebat spectata sitim procul omnibus unda ;
 Jam fusa excussit militis unda sitim.

In H. Grotium.

Grotius effigie puer hac florebat : amice,
 Dic vidisse senem, lector, Aristotelem.

In Thaidem.

Scribe mihi in tumulto : mortem si lubrica Thais
 Nosset, vixisset sobria : disce mori.

In Phyllida.

Lætitia quoniam nimia plerosque perisse
 Novimus ; ut moriar, me mea Phyllis amat.

M. S.

HOSPES. MEMENTO. DUM. LICET. VITA. FRUI.
 ID. OSSA. NOSTRA. TE. MONENT. NON. SUM. FUI.

In Annam G.

Diogenes capta fertur petiisse laterna
 Clara luce probum, nec reperisse, virum ;
 Si bona quæratul mulier, labor omnis inanis,
 Mortua cum sit in hoc Anna sepulta solo.

M. S.

VIXI. UT. VIVIS.
 MORIERIS. UT. SUM. MORTUUS.
 SIC. VITA. TRUDITUR.
 VALE. VIATOR.
 ET. ABI. IN REM. TUAM.

Adonis.

Floriferis fueras qui laudatissimus hortis,
 Nunc legeris flores inter, Adoni, novos.

Arserat ut vivum, e cunctis sic floribus unum
Nunc adamat spreta te Cytherea rosa.

In Mortem.

Formido mortis morte pejor : non potes
Vitare mortem, sed potes contemnere.

In disertissimum.

Si fontes, fluvii, feræ, paludes,
Montes, robora, sunt secuta quondam
Vocem mellifluam canentis Orphei,
Permirum : sed enim magis stupere
Ni te suaviloquus sequatur Orpheus.

In Venerem marmoream.

Nescio cur Venerem meretricem carmina dicant.
Hoc scio, quod nil hac castius esse potest.

M. S.

QUOD. QUISQUE. VESTRUM. OPTAVERIT. MIHI.
ILLI. SEMPER. EVENIAT.
VIVO. ET. MORTUO.

LANGUAGES AND DIALECTS, in which the translation, printing, and distribution of the Scriptures have been promoted by the British and Foreign Bible Society.

IN some of the following languages and dialects, the Scriptures, or parts of them, had been printed before. These are distinguished as *Reprints*, being *forty-three* in number.

In others, they had never been printed before the institution of the Society. These are denoted as *Not printed before*, and, when added to those translated or translating, make the number of *eighty-eight*.

A third class consists of new translations into languages into which the Scriptures, or parts of them, have been formerly translated; and are noticed as *Re-translations*; often, indeed, being almost wholly new. These are in *eight* languages or dialects.

114 *Translations of the Holy Scriptures.*

The last class is that of those which are translated or translating, but not yet printed; and are marked as *Translated or Translating*: and these are such as had not been printed before, in every instance except that of the Modern Greek.

These distinctions are noted in the following Lists.

AT HOME.

Re-prints :

- | | | | | | | |
|------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------|--|--------------|------------|
| 1. Arabic. | 2. Danish. | 3. Dutch. | 4. English. | 5. Ethiopic (or Ecclesiastical Language of Abyssinia). | 6. French. | 7. Gaelic. |
| 8. German. | 9. Greek (Ancient). | 10. Greek (Modern). | 11. Hebrew. | 12. Irish. | 13. Italian. | 14. Malay. |
| 15. Manks. | 16. Portuguese. | 17. Spanish. | 18. Syriac. | 19. Welsh. | | |

Not printed before :

- | | | |
|------------|---------------|------------|
| 1. Bullom. | 2. Esquimaux. | 3. Mohawk. |
|------------|---------------|------------|

Re-translation :

Hindoostanee, or Oordoo.

Translating :

Arawack (Indian).

BY GRANTS OF A GENERAL NATURE.

Reprints :

- | | | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------|------------|---------------|
| 1. Greenlandish. | 2. Greek (Ancient). | 3. Hebrew. | 4. Hungarian. |
| 5. Icelandic. | 6. Italian. | 7. Latin. | 8. Slavonian. |
| 9. Wendish, or Vandalian. | | | |

Not printed before :

- | | | | |
|------------|----------------|--------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1. Calmuc. | 2. Otaheitean. | 3. Tartar-Turkish. | 4. Tartar, in Hebrew Characters. |
|------------|----------------|--------------------|----------------------------------|

Re-translations :

- | | | | |
|-------------|------------|----------------------------------|-------------|
| 1. Chinese. | 2. German. | 3. Greek (Modern) New Testament. | 4. Turkish. |
|-------------|------------|----------------------------------|-------------|

Translated or Translating :

1. Albanian.
2. Ethiopic-Amharic (one of the vernacular dialects of Abyssinia).
3. Ethiopic-Tigre (the other vernacular dialect of Abyssinia).
4. Greek (Modern) Old Testament.

BY GRANTS TO INDIA.

Reprints :

- | | | | |
|--------------|--------------|-----------|-----------|
| 1. Armenian. | 2. Bengalee. | 3. Malay. | 4. Tamul. |
|--------------|--------------|-----------|-----------|

Not printed before :

- | | | | |
|------------------------|---------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| 1. Afghan, or Pushtoo. | 2. Assamese. | 3. Bhutuneer. | 4. Bikaner. |
| 5. Bruj. | 6. Burman. | 7. Canarese, or Kurnata. | 8. Gudwal. |
| 9. Gujuratee. | 10. Harotee. | 11. Hindee. | 12. Joypore. |
| 13. Juynugur. | 14. Kanouj. | 15. Kashmeer. | 16. Khassee. |
| 17. Konkuna. | 18. Kutch. | 19. Mahratta. | 20. Malayalim. |
| 21. Maruwar. | 22. Mithilee. | | |

23. Nepal. 24. Oodoypore. 25. Oojjuinee. 26. Orissa. 27. Sanscrit.
28. Seik, or Punjabee. 29. Telinga, or Telugoo. 30. Watch, Wucha,
or Multanee.

Re-translations:

1. Arabic. 2. Chinese. 3. Cingalese. 4. Hindoostanee, or Oordoo
5. Persian.

Translated or Translating:

1. Bhojpooree. 2. Bhugelkhundee. 3. Birat. 4. Budrinathee. 5. Bugis.
6. Bulochee. 7. Bundelkhundec. 8. Huriyana. 9. Jagatai, or
Turcoman. 10. Javanese. 11. Jumboo. 12. Kanynkooja. 13.
Koomaon. 14. Kousulee. 15. Kucharee. 16. Macassar. 17.
Maldivian. 18. Mughuda. 19. Munipoor. 20. Munipoor-Koonkee.
21. Palpa, or Dogura. 22. Rakheng. 23. Siamese. 24. Sindhee.
25. Southern Sindhoo, or Hydrabad. 26. Tiipoora-Koonkee.

BY GRANTS IN EUROPE.

To the Russian Bible Society and its Auxiliaries.

Reprints:

1. Armenian. 2. Dorpatian-Esthonian. 3. Finnish. 4. French.
5. Georgian. 6. Greek (Ancient). 7. Greek (Modern).
8. German. 9. Lettonian, or Lettish. 10. Moldavian, or Walla-
chian. 11. Polish. 12. Revalian-Esthonian. 13. Slavonian.

Not printed before:

1. Buriat-Mongolian. 2. Calmuc. 3. Karelian. 4. Olenetz-
Karelian. 5. Orenburg-Tartar. 6. Russ (Modern). 7. Samogitian.
8. Tartar. 9. Tartar-Turkish. 10. Tscheremissian. 11. Tschu-
washtian. 12. Turkish Armenian. 13. Servian.

Re-Translation:

Persian.

Translated or Translating:

1. Bulgarian. 2. Mordwaschian. 3. Ostiakian. 4. Samojedien.
5. Siberian-Tartar. 6. Tschpojirian. 7. Tungusian. 8. Wogu-
lian. 9. Wotagish.

To other Bible Societies.

Re-prints:

1. Bohemian. 2. Danish. 3. Dutch. 4. Finnish. 5. French
(to two Societies). 6. German (to eight Societies). 7. Italian. 8.
Laponese. 9. Lithuanian. 10. Malay (in Arabic characters). 11.
Polish (to two Societies). 12. Romanese (Ladinische). 13. Roma-
nese (Churwelsche). 14. Swedish. 15. Wendish, or Vandalian (to
two Societies).

Re-translations:

1. Creolese. 2. German.

Translated or Translating:

Faroese.

GRANTS TO AMERICA.

Re-prints:

1. English. 2. French. 3. Spanish. 4. Mohawk.

Not printed before :

Delaware (Indian).

RECAPITULATION.	
Re-prints.....	43
Re-translations	8
Languages and Dialects, in which the Scriptures have never been printed before the Institution of the Society	88
Total of Languages and Dialects	139

*Concise View of the Translations of the Holy Scriptures,
extracted from the Seventh Memoir of the BAPTIST
MISSION, dated Serampore, Dec. 1820.*

1. *IN Bengalee*, the fifth edition of the New Testament, containing 5,000 copies, which was printed off about three years ago, is nearly exhausted, and of the different parts of the Old, scarcely a single copy has been left for some time past. The continual demand for this version, therefore, has rendered it necessary to print a new edition of the whole Scriptures. This edition, which will form the *sixth* edition of the New Testament, and the *third* of the Psalms, and some other parts of the Old Testament, will consist of 4,000 copies, and of the New Testament 2,000 extra, the demand being so very great. By using a new fount of types, of a reduced size, and printing in double columns, on a large octavo page, the brethren hope to bring the whole five volumes into one volume of about 1,300 pages, royal octavo, or two very moderate volumes, and the New Testament into a neat duodecimo of about 400 pages.

2. In the *Sungskrit*, the last volume of the Old Testament was printed off above two years ago. The first edition of the New Testament is quite exhausted, and the numerous calls for the Scriptures in this language by the literati of India, have induced the brethren to put to press a second edition of the whole Scriptures. This will likewise be printed in double columns in the large octavo size, and the whole Scriptures be comprised in one volume. It will consist of 2,000 copies, with an extra number of 2,000 New Testaments.

3. In the *Hindee*, also, the last volume of the Old Testament was published nearly two years ago. The edition of the

New Testament being nearly exhausted, and Mr. Chamberlain having prepared another version of the New Testament in this language, for which his long residence in the Western provinces of India, and his intimate acquaintance with their popular dialects, eminently fit him, the brethren have resolved in this edition to print his version of the New Testament, instead of their own, as a comparison of independent versions, made by persons long and intimately acquainted with the language, will be of the utmost value in ultimately forming a correct, chaste, and perspicuous version in this widely extended language. Of this edition of the New Testament, which is more than half through the press, they are printing 2,000 copies.

4. In the *Orissa* language the whole Scriptures have been long published. The first edition of the New Testament being exhausted, and the demand for this version still increasing, the brethren have prepared a second edition, which is now more than half through the press. It consists of 4,000 copies.

5. The last volume of the Old Testament in the *Mahratta* language was published many months ago, so that a version of the whole Scriptures in that language is now completed. Of the first edition of the New Testament, not a single copy being left, they have put to press a second edition, in a duodecimo size.

In these five languages the whole of the Scriptures are now published and in circulation; in the last four of them *second* editions of the New Testament are in the press, and in the first, the Bengalee, begun 26 years ago, the *sixth* edition of the New Testament. In the following ten languages the New Testament is published, or nearly so; and in some of them the Pentateuch, and other parts of the Old Testament.

1. In the *Chinese* language the translation of the Old Testament was completed several years ago. In addition to the New Testament, the Pentateuch, the Hagiographa, and the Prophetic Books, are now printed off. The Historical books, which will complete the whole Scriptures, are in the press, and will probably be published before the end of the ensuing year.

2. In the *Shikh* language, besides the New Testament, the Pentateuch and the Historical Books are printed off; and the Hagiographa is advanced as far as the middle of the book of Job. So strong, however, has been the desire of this nation for the New Testament, that the whole edition is nearly distributed, and a second edition will probably be called for before the Old Testament is wholly published. Excepting the Mugs

on the borders of Arracan, no one of the nations of India has discovered a stronger desire for the Scriptures than this hardy race; and the distribution of almost every copy has been accompanied with the pleasing hope of its being read and valued.

3. In the *Pushtoo* or *Affghan* language, the nation supposed by some to be descended from the ten tribes, the New Testament has been printed off. The Pentateuch is also advanced at press as far as the book of Leviticus.

4. In the *Telinga* or *Teloogoo* language, the New Testament was published two years ago, and the Pentateuch is printed as far as the book of Leviticus. This translation however, when the Pentateuch is finished, the brethren intend to resign to the Madras Auxiliary Bible Society.

5. In the *Kunkuna* language, the New Testament was completed above 18 months ago; and the Pentateuch is advanced at press as far as the book of Numbers. As this province comes immediately under the care of the Bombay Bible Society, it is intended, on the completion of the Pentateuch at press, to relinquish this translation to them.

6. In the *Wuch*, or *Mooltanee* language, the New Testament has been printed off these 18 months, in its own character. But, as the opportunities for distributing this version have been exceedingly limited, and they have little prospect of establishing a mission in that province, they have dismissed the pundit, and discontinued the translation, till these circumstances, with those of a pecuniary nature, shall be more favorable.

7. In the *Assam* language, also, the New Testament has been printed off nearly two years, and the vicinity of this country to Bengal, rendering it highly desirable to proceed with the translation, an edition of the Old Testament has been put to press, in the large octavo size, in double columns, which will very considerably lessen the expense, the character being similar to the Bengalee, both in form and size.

8. In the *Gujuratee* language the New Testament is now happily brought through the press, 13 years after retaining the first pundit in this language. It makes between 8 and 900 pages, and is printed in the Deva Naguree character. This translation the brethren intend to resign to their brethren from the London Missionary Society, who are now studying the language, that they may give their attention more fully to those in which no others are engaged.

9. In the *Bikaneer* language, also, the New Testament is now finished at press. It contains 800 pages, and is printed in the Naguree character. This version was begun nearly seven years ago.

10. To these we may add the New Testament in the *Kashmeer* language, which version has been in hand nearly eight years, and will be finished at press in about a month. It is printed in a neat type of its own, as mentioned in a former memoir. In these ten languages the New Testament may be considered as being published.

Besides these *fifteen* in which the New Testament is completed, there are *six* other languages in which it is brought more than half through the press. These are, the *Kurnata*, the *Nepal*, the *Harutee*, the *Marwar*, the *Bhughulkund*, and the *Oojein* versions. About ten months more, they have reason to hope, will bring these through the press; and thus in twenty-one of the languages of India, and these by far the most extensive and important, the New Testament will be published. It is the intention of the brethren to relinquish the first of these, the *Kurnata*, to the Madras Bible Society, on the New Testament being completed, that they may be better able to attend to the remaining languages in which no version is begun by any one besides.

The remaining versions now in hand are the following ten, which are all in the press.

The *Jumboo*, *Kanouj*, and *Khassee*, printed as far as John: the *Khoshul*, *Bhutuneer*, *Dogura*, and *Mogudha*, to Mark: and the *Kumaoon*, *Gudwal*, and *Munipoora*, to Matthew.

In these ten versions, therefore, a sufficient progress is made to render the completion of them in no way difficult.

In comparing this memoir with the last it will be seen, that in several of the languages mentioned in it the translation has been discontinued. To this the brethren have been constrained, by the low state of the translation fund, arising principally from the heavy expenses occasioned by new editions of the *Sanskrit*, the *Bengalee*, the *Hindee*, and the *Orissa Scriptures*, now in the press. In discontinuing these, however, they have been guided by a due consideration of the importance and the distinctness of the different languages in which they are engaged, as well as the ease with which pundits could be procured, should the public enable them to resume them again.

CARMEN SECULARE.

*meliusque semper,
Proroget ævum.*

HOR. CARM. SEC.

Anno M.DCCC.I¹ ineunte.

FESTA diu Veterum, sacrisque piamina ludis,
Thure dato populi, linguis animisque faventis,
Jam seculo referente vices, ac mystica lustra,
Omnia sunt vulgata; quis antiquissima Vatis
Carmina Cumææ nescit, Janique bifrontis
Ora revolventes ævi reparantia lapsus?
Cui non dicta prius Latonia, gente Quirini
Sospite, Musarumque sacerdos tempore¹ dio
Cui non et Pueri custos, te, Phœbe, precantes?

At mihi nunc tentanda via est, qua dicere possim
Non prius auditum carmen, centumque peractis
Jam modo, venturisque simul gratariæ annis:
Vellem equidem! at nostræ mentis majora tuenti
Deficiunt vires; tantum patet æquor arandum.
Aspice! ut ætherii lustrarit tramitis orbe
Sidera, centuplicique implerit tempora gyro
Solis iter; terræ quæ raro viderit hospes,
Atque iterum visurus erit, nova secula surgunt.

Tantarum mistos etiam si carmen in unum
Digerere, et sperem cumulos advolvere verum;
Promptius aut numero Libycas comprehendere arenas
Aggrediar, vastave imponere Pelion Ossa.

At tu perpetua mundum qui lege gubernas,
Summe Pater, stabilisque manens das cuncta moveri,
Qui relegis fontes ævi, quique aspicias unus
Annorum innumeram seriem, succurre canenti.
O mihi præteritos sit fas evolvere fastos,
Et fata in nostrum labentia pandere seclum.
Unde animus, dubito, sumat primordia, quove
Altius incumbens deducat carmina filo?
Anne legens memori vestigia singula cura
Ordine respiciam tempus, quo sceptræ Vilhelmus

¹ This Poem is not inserted in the Carmina Græca et Latina of the Author.

Sustinuit, nostrisque dedit nova jura Britannis?
Te neque per populum partis Regina triumphis
Fœmineum incedens patriæ decus, Anna, silebo;
Tantaque Marlburii ducis insignita tropæa,
Quæ grata æternat memori Blenheimia fastu.
Proximus antiquo genus amplum e stemmate ducens,
Stemmate Brunsviaco, regni suscepit habenas
Georgius, atque omni Britonas dititione beavit.
Filius hinc surgit, cui clari e nomine Patris
Nomen idem emicuit, quo non felicior alter
Omne fortunæ, successuque acrior ipso;
Quem spoliis toties testatur America raptis,
Victoremque sub orbe novo stabilita potestas.

Sed quid ego hæc nostri revocans exordia secli,
Regesque antiquos, elapsaque tempora rerum,
Longe oculos retro flectam? cum Georgius alter
Pierium sibi poscit opus, mihi carminis alta
Materies, chartæ merito pars maxima nostræ:
At neque si variis centum mihi ferrea linguis
Ora sonent, cumulatam accingar dicere famam,
Quamquam animus meminisse cupit, quodcunque relinquam
Majus erit; tantæ splendent præconia laudis.
Ac veluti Elæo effusus cum carcere, raptim
Fertur equis, latoque volat super æquore currus;
In tua sic patet ingenti certamine facta
Area, Pegaseoque (neque altior audit habenas)
Emicat in laudes amplas mens plena volatu.
Qualis ubi glandis de semine Dodonæo
Tenuis adhuc planta, et frondosis abdita sylvis,
Serpit humi nitens, paulatim assurgit in auras,
Fœtaque luxuriat ramis; ad sidera tandem
Vi propria quercus felicior exiit ævo.
Aut ubi arundinibus, contractoque obsitus alveo
Vix querulum rivus rumpit per gramina cursum;
Carbasa quo nulla infantur, nullumque phaselus
Signat iter; cum mox sinuoso tramite vires
Colligit, increscitque capacibus auctior undis,
In mare purpureum donec devolvitur amnis;
Tum lustrans oculus stupet immetata videndo
Æquora, velivolisque natantes navibus oras.
Per varias rerumque vices, operumque colores,
Haud aliter, repetens si prima ab origine pergam,
Parva fuit, donec decurrens secula crevit
Anglia fertilibus (crescatque potentior) horis.

Numine concordēs stabili nexuque valentes,
 Talia crediderim (quæ nulla obliteret ætas)
 Carmine veridico pensum sublime trahentes,
 Fata suis olim fuis cecinisse Sorores.

“ Albion, Oceani dilecta gemma corona,
 Nympharumque decus, quæ pandunt, accipe, Parcæ,
 Accipe, et insigni tibi serves omnia luce.
 Aggredere O ! (erit exoptabile tempus) honores,
 Brunsviaci generis veniat mox tertius hæres,
 Grande viri eximiis virtutibus incrementum.
 Stamina venturum ducentia, currite, pensum.
 Ille, velut rector qui providus ardua clavi
 Temperat, et fluctus tempestatesque futuras
 Edocet, alta diu rerum moderamina sumet;
 En ! hujus viden’ auspiciis, pulchra Insula, jactans
 Egregios heroas ales pietate, vel armis
 Illustres animas, inituraque nomina fastos.

“ Stamina, venturum ducentia, currite, pensum.
 Hic vir hic est, quondam fausto qui sidere seclum
 Condet, et aspiciet florentia lumina nasci ;
 Ad laudum celeri nitens fastigia gressu,
 Proferet, ignotum terras qua continet æquor,
 Imperium ; crescentque alio partī orbe triumphī.
 Quem non vicino remorabitur obvia Marte
 Gallia, nec conjuratæ subvertere gentes.
 Stamina venturum ducentia, currite, pensum.”

Talia veraces præfantur carmine Parcæ,
 Parcæ, multiplici faciem distincta metallo,
 Secula queis parent, ævique arcana patescunt.
 Nec levibus sane auguriis, aut omine nullo
 Hinc fore mansurum pandunt per tempora nomen,
 Nos fortuna favens rerumque benignior ordo
 Retulit in melius, solidaque in sede locavit.
 Interea omnigenis quæsita est gloria nobis
 Artibus ; ad summum excusis venere cacumen
 Ingeniis homines ; quicquid mortale tenemus ;
 Nam quæcunque regunt magnum miracula mundum
 Ars docuit ; ratioque in luminis eruit oras ;
 Laudibus hinc nos exæquat victoria cœlo.
 Scilicet inventis debentur plurima seclis.
 Antiquis hominum, quæ susceperē laboris
 Dura rudimenta, et cultæ tentamina mentis ;
 Nos augemus opes, partim vestigia nota
 Sectati, at partim auspiciis melioribus usi

Nitimur, exultimque nova ditescimur arte.

Anne prius, pariter dicendi, et utraque corona
 Dignati, pacis nire, bellive labores?
 Singula complecti cuperem, sed densior instat
 Actorum series, rerumque sequacibus undis
 Obruimur; quantis se clarior extulit atas!
 Quæ quibus anteferam, dubito; laus debita cuique est.
 Cerno hic heroas, quos vitæ prodiga virtus,
 Gestaque testatus non dedecorasse parentum
 Nobilitavit honos, et fama immiscuit astris.
 Quique hic ingenuas vitam excoluere per artes,
 Non hederæ sine laude jacent, ingrataque Musis
 Tempora; cui fontes integros ipse reclusit
 Phœbus, et ipse dedit contingere cuncta lepore,
 Castalidum ante oculos proles lectissima surgit;
 Quam nutrix Rhedycina canet, quotiesque recenset
 Grata suos celebresque memor per secula cives,
 Pierios laude insigni jactabit alumnos:
 Quosque omnes Sophiæ qui norunt carpere flores;
 En, caput attollit, rerumque Scientia veras
 Altior evolvit causas, jamque abdita diæ,
 Et quæ præteritis latuere incognita seclis,
 Clastra patent Naturæ, umbras pellente Mathesi:
 Ante alios princeps Neutonus, ut ætherius Sol
 Præfulgens, animæ latebras patefecit opertas.
 Intima panduntur victi penetralia cœli;
 Aërias tentare domos, terraque relicta
 Limina percurrans extra radiantia mundi
 Mœnia, palantes inter spatiarier ignes,
 Hinc species captare novas, mens vivida gestit.
 Artibus his melius superi miracula lustrant
 Orbis, et incerti numerant sua sidera nautæ;
 Dumque notant taciti argenteos puro æthere tractus,
 Attoniti monstrante Sopho, nova surgere late
 Astra vident; insigne micans per inane vagatur
 Stellæ tuo dignata hæc inter nomine Georgi.

Quæ prius audaci non velificata carina
 Æquora, et ambitas ignoto flumine terras,
 Qua tepidum ad Solem pennas in littore pandunt
 Halcyones, et amica calentes vergit ad Austros
 Temperies cœli; quave Arctica turbine campos
 Verrit hyems, et Hyperboreos Sol igne sereno
 Parcius irradiat fines; animatque vigore,
 Navibus explorat, pelagi cui major aperti

Fama, triumphatos emensa Britannia fluctus,
 Pacatosque suis mittit sub legibus orbes.
 Hinc nostras varii repetens discrimina ponti
 Divitias vehit, extremos Mercator ad Indos
 Impiger, hinc vigili fruitur gens dissita cura
 Principis invicti, et nobis porrecta sine ullo
 Limite regna patent, commerciaque ultima terræ.
 Nec minus armatis sibi navibus arrogat æquor
 Albion; externæ quæ non victricia gentes
 Signa timent? quæ non metuenda tonitrua classis?
 Anglica dum quercus domito, quocunque sub axe
 Decertet, dat jura mari, laudumque cupido
 Corda arrecta fovet nulla formidine flecti.
 Vidimus hinc, nobis cum visit adorca, Iberum
 Dejectos fastus, Batavumque aplustria velis
 Direpta, et penitus Thetidi submissa Britannæ.
 Ac nobis bello undantem quis nescit opimo
 Nilum, quis merita exstructis monumenta columnis?
 Ire iterum in laudes, iterum victricia circum
 Tempora, navales sertis intexere laurus,
 O tantis spectate heros, assuete triumphis,
 Tu patriæ columen, tu diri fœderis ultor,
 Musa tibi, Nelson, parat; quis carmine digno
 Arctoa memoret nuper quæ parte geruntur,
 Codanoque sinu? qualem te vidit in undis
 Hafnia! qualem te Cimbri sensere ruentes!
 En video ut belli horrendus sese explicet ordo
 Puppibus instructis, adversoque obvia rostro
 Fulmina tormenti, utque impulsu ferveat æquor,
 Sanguine cæsum infectas heu! decolor undas:
 Dum Britonum invictis congressum viribus hostem,
 Conspicor immensa disiectum strage suorum,
 Quassatasque rates, et non reparabile funus.

His freta auxiliis posuit fundamina famæ
 Æterna, atque ausis ingens sedet Anglia, gentes
 Debellare potens, et parcere debellatis,
 Statque sibi in tanto felix concordia Marte.

At procul interea, lucem sine nube tuenti,
 Quis tempestatem glomerat medio æthere fœdam
 Collectus vapor? agnosco contagia late
 Fatales auras diramque efflantia tabem;
 Dicam acies, disrupto haud dudum fœdere gentem,
 Seditionis opus dicam, Gallosque rebelles
 In sua civili conversos viscera dextra,

Jusque datum sceleri, tractosque in funera reges.
Qualis ubi campos insano sævior Euro
Infestat turbo Asiacos, aut Africus acer
Pestiferas agitat pennas, teterrimus aër
Spargitur, et late bacchatur letifer æstus.
Intima per totum haud aliter contagia manant
Imperium; alta sedent infandi, vulnera motus.
Utque magis regnum permiscent omne tumultu,
Subjicit ipsa faces, quas condita nutrit, Erinnyes,
Irasque, insidiasque, serit quoque crimina belli;
Hinc odiis lymphata furit, grassata per urbem,
Contemptrixque Dei, impatiens sine lege Tyrannis.
Infelix Ludoice, cadis; nec te tua forma,
Nec tua te virtus damnatam heu! vindice nullo
Devotum eripuit caput, Antoinetta, securi.

O male concordēs! nimioque cupidine cæci,
Suspectique dolis pariter fideique sinistri,
Tollite jam cristas, fœcundaque pectora, Galli,
Concutite, urgentes stimulos in prælia menti
Scilicet, et nova libertas causam arrogat armis.

Ecce etiam tali sentit se peste teneri
Europa, effunditque malignior aura venenum.
Sola inter gentes flagraute Britannia motu
Ut pelagi cautes circumstridentibus undis
Inconcussa manet, superans oblivia noctis
Invida, et observat vestigia sancta Parentum.
Non hic civilis rabies, nil turbida rupto
Ordine mutatis Novitas tentavit habenis:
Nullæ hic insidiæ tales; licet hostis in armis
Fulminet, excidioque daturum nostra minetur,
Inque dies sub pace vetans requiescere gentes,
Prolato ebrius imperio, rebusque secundis,
Eruat alterius sociæ fundamina vitæ,
Est sua tempestas, et fert sua vulnera, clades:
Certatimque licet toto est jam corpore regni,
Ambitioque recens in aperta pericula cives
Projiciat toties, ignotaque bella lacessat;
Credo quidem accenso haud nobis certamine dextra
Frigida, si soliti vires modo roboris adsint.
Testis ubi ad terræ jam nunc Memphitidis oram,
Heu toties vexatam armis, ubi sistere detur,
Incertam, et dubiis tractam in contraria fati,
Fulminat in bello, Britonumque exercitus ingens
Audet speratis Gallos detrudere regnis.

At vos, O Nostri Proceres, utriusque Senatus
 Dum fata excutitis, Martisque evolvitis oras,
 Consulite in medium, nec tali in cardine rerum
 Bellum importunum (si fas vitare) geratur :
 Sat famæ lacrymisque datum est, nec fœderis æquas
 Spernamus leges, coeant in pignora dextræ,
 Ærataque sera claudamus limina Jani !
 Occidit Arctous conjuratusque Tyrannus¹
 Rumpere res Britonum, auspiciis melioribus opto
 Imperio subeat nobis minus obviis hæres,
 Surgentes annos melius Pax alma secundet
 Omine lætifico, et ducat pæana sequestrem.
 Quanquam inter rerum strépitus et fulmina Martis
 Armorumque minas viget imperterrita, vellet
 Inter victrices palmas laurique coronam
 Anglia pacifica frontem circumdare oliva ;
 At casus accincta pati, magno impete nisus
 Sustinet hostiles, et parte avertit ab omni,
 Saltibus in Marsis, aut Montano Erymantho ;
 Talis aper longe latratibus erigit actus
 Ingentes inembrorum artus, comprehendit et ipsis
 Morsibus instantes catulos, et mole sua stat.
 Jamque etiam æterna servandis laude calendis
 (Dignus enim auspiciis sese regalibus annus
 Induit, et digno prodit mirabilis ortu)
 Optato tenet amplexu Soror alma Sororem,
 Angliacoque sinu sociam se credit Ierne.
 Felices ambæ coeunt, mens una duabus, .
 Curiaque una Patrum, atque omnes uno ore Britanni ;
 Haud aliter jussit lustris labentibus olim
 Angliaco Scotos transcribier Anna senatu.
 Sic ubi diversæ geminum discurrit in alveum
 Vena perennis aquæ, mox influit amnis in amnem
 Auctior hinc laticum coitus, cognataque lympha
 Liberioris aquæ campo spatatur aperto.
 Utraque sic erit unanimi firmata tenore
 Terra potens, famaue magis magis increbrescet.
 Dumque adamanteis curvatus brachia saxis
 Fluviorum Rex Oceanus circumdata munit
 Littora, se mediis in fluctibus utraque tollet
 Felix prole Virum, felix cœlestibus armis,
 Auspiciisque tuis, patriæ pater, inclyte Georgi,

¹ Paulus scil. Imperator.

Macte animi, Princeps, populi cui jure volentes
 Permittunt triplicis sceptri inviolabile pignus ;
 Macte animi ! exhaustos terraque marique labores
 Imperioque tuo casus superavimus omnes.
 Didita fama tua est ; reparant dum tempora lapsus,
 Dum cœli stabilem servant convexa tenorem,
 Acta retro faciles oculos per secula ducent
 Heroes nondum nati, ætas ultimâ nostras
 Leges et studia et mores et prælia dicet,
 Cæsaris et nostri fastis memorabile nomen.
 Interea tua cum redeat pars debita cœlo
 (Ah ! sero redeat, valeasque diu, inclyte, nobis)
 Accipiat Patris exemplum, tribuatque nepoti
 Filius, ac veluti quæ se ipsa reseminat ales
 Unica, Brunsviaci ne desit stemmatis hæres :
 Stet fortuna domus, decus admirabile regni !
 Tuque, Deus, qui das magnos procedere menses,
 Incolumem serves terram ! imperioque Britanno
 Dexter, ut ante, fave, lacrymosaque bella famemque
 Averte e populo, et nostris, precor, annue cœptis.
 Non ego venturos audebo dicere casus ;
 Nec Patria, ut simulans Vates, tibi fungor inani
 Munere ; sin aliquid veri augurat, accipe, terræ
 Quæ natalis amor, quæ mens tibi fervida vovit,
 “ Esto perpetua, et felicibus utere fatis.”

RICHARD PAUL JODRELL.

ΓΡΑΦΙΚΗ ἙΤΑΙΡΙΑ of Corfu.

AT the present moment every communication relating to the existing state of Greece must possess some degree of interest. Under this impression, I transmit to you some extracts from a document published at Corfu, which has lately arrived in this country. The subject of it is new, at least in Greece, and many of the titles and designations occurring in it, which in their plain English garb would be familiar acquaintances, will scarcely be recognised in their Ionian dress. When we state that the object of this production is to give an account of the constitution and

establishment of the Ionian Γραφικὴ Ἑταιρεία, we shall not be surprised if the term at first startle your classical readers, who may search in vain among all the *συνωμοσίαι* of Athens for an explanation of the nature of this non-descript institution.

The title of the publication stands thus, *Περὶ τῆς ἐν Κερκύρᾳ συστάσεως τῆς Ἰωνικῆς Γραφικῆς Ἑταιρείας*. “Account of the formation in Corcyra of the Ionian Bible Society.” We shall proceed to give a concise account of its contents, premising that the language of the composition in general approaches near to that of ancient Greece, and in many passages might really appear classical, with the alteration or omission of some of the common particles, *δεν, να, με, &c.*

The introduction is somewhat in the prefatory and generalising style.

Πᾶς ἓνας φιλάνθρωπος δὲν ἤμπορεῖ νὰ μὴ εὐφρανθῇ, παρατηρῶν τοὺς μεγάλους καὶ παραδόξους ἀγῶνας, ὅσοι γίνονται ἐπὶ ἡμερῶν μας, ἵνα βελτιωθῇ ἡ στάσις τοῦ ἀνθρώπινου γένους παρὰ πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, ἐν ᾧ προβιβάζεται ἡ ἀνατροφὴ καὶ ἀγωγή ὅλης ἐν γένει τῆς Νεολαίας, καὶ διαδίδεται πρὸς ὅλους τοὺς ἀνούς τοῦ Θεϊκοῦ Θελήματος ἡ γνῶσις, ὡς αἱ Ἱεραὶ Γραφαὶ τὸ διαλαμβάνουσιν.

After enlarging a little on the benefits of the two “Συστήματα” here alluded to, the institutions for facilitating education and the societies for promoting the more general diffusion of the sacred volume, the writer proceeds to inform us that a few of the good people of Corfu, being well acquainted with the scarcity of copies of the Scriptures among their Christian countrymen, had long cherished *χρηστὰς ἐλπίδας νὰ ἴδωσι συστημένην ἐν τῷ Ἠνωμένῳ Ἑπταμερεῖ Κράτει τοῦ Ἰονίου μίαν Γραφικὴν Ἑταιρίαν*.

We then come to the realisation of these hopes in a meeting which took place in the month of July, 1819, in the palace of Baron Theotoky, President of the Senate. Among the personages present,

Διεκρίνοντο κατ' ἐξοχὴν ὅτε Θεοφιλέστατος Ἀρχιερεὺς Μακάριος, ὁ Τοποτηρητὴς Κερκύρας, μετὰ πολλῶν ἄλλων αἰδεσίμων Μελῶν τοῦ Ἱερατείου αὐτοῦ, ὁ Βουλευταὶ τοῦ Ἠνωμένου Κράτους τοῦ Ἰονίου, τινὰ ἐκ τῶν Μελῶν τοῦ ὑπερτάτου τῆς Δικαιοσύνης Συμβουλίου, ὁ Ὑπαρχος Κερκύρας, καὶ διάφορα Μέλη τῶν Δικαιοκρατειῶν καὶ τῶν Ἐφορειῶν παρευρισκοντο προίετι αὐτοῦ καὶ πολλοὶ Ἀρχόντες καὶ Ἐμποροὶ ἐκ τῶν Ἐγκρίτων, ἀφ' ὧν ὅλων ὁμοῦ συνετάττετο μίᾳ ἀξιοσεβαστοτάτῃ ὁμήγυρις ἐκατὸν ἀνθρώπων καὶ περισσότερον, ἐξ ἀπασῶν σχεδὸν τῶν Ἐκκλησιῶν, καὶ ἐξ Ἑθνῶν διαφόρων.

His Highness the Baron (Ἡ Ὑψηλότης τοῦ γοῦν ὁ Βαρὼν Θεοτόκης) opened the business of the day by stating the general ob-

jects of Bible Societies, and giving some account of the progress which they had already made; and he is said to have so done δι' ἐνὸς αὐτοσχεδίου, εὐλέτου καὶ εὐφραδοῦς λόγου.

Καὶ ἐνεχρόνισε μικρὸν ἐπάνω εἰς τὰς παραδόξους προόδους τῶν Συστάσεων τούτων ἐν γένει, καὶ ἐπάνω εἰς ὅτας ἐγένοντο ἐν τῇ Μεγάλῃ Βρεττανίᾳ καὶ ἐν τῇ Αὐτοκρατορίᾳ τῶν Ῥωσσιῶν, εἰς Ἑψηλὴν Γερμανίαν, Γαλλίαν, Ἀμερικὴν, Ἰνδίας, καὶ εἰς πολλὰ ἄλλα μέρη τοῦ κόσμου, ὅπου αἱ Γραφικαὶ Ἑταιρίαι πράττονται καὶ βοηθοῦνται ἐν ἐργῶν τε καὶ εὐχέλως παρὰ πάσης ταξέως ἀνθρώπων.

He then proceeded to give orders for the reading of the Fundamental Regulations of the Society, τὰ οὐσιώδη καὶ βέβαια Διατάγματα καὶ Κανόνες τῆς Ἑταιρίας. The very epithets seem to have something of a sound of permanency and stability about them; and afterwards called upon those present—

να δηλοποιήσωσιν ἐλευθέρως τὴν ἰδίαν αὐτῶν γνώμην, ἀνίσως ἐπίστευον ὅτι τὰ Διατάγματα αὐτὰ ἤθελον ἔχῃ ἐλλείψιν τινα, ἢ παραδρομήν.

No opposition being offered, he officially announced that the Society was to be considered as established, and the regulations confirmed. The meeting then proceeded to the election of a president; a business carried on much in the same way as affairs of a similar nature in England.

Κατὰ τὸ 3^{τον} Ἀρθρον λοιπὸν τῶν Διαταγμάτων αὐτῶν, ἡ Ἑψηλότης τοῦ συνεκάλεσε τοὺς Ἑταίρους νὰ προβάλλωσι τὰ ὑποκείμενα ἐκεῖνα, ὅσα ἐκρίνον ἀξιώτερα, διὰ τε τὸν φωτισμὸν τοῦ πνεύματος καὶ τὰ χρεστάτα τῶν ἡθῶν, νὰ βαστάσωσι τὸ φορτίον τοῦ Προέδρου τῆς Ἑταιρίας. Τότε ἡ Πανιερωτάτη καὶ ἀληθὴς τῆς Ὁρθοδόξου Ἀνατολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῶν Κορφῶν προλαμβάνουσα ἐπιεικῶς τὴν φανέρωσιν τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν Ἑταίρων στόλου, ἐσκέφθη ὅτι τὸ Ἑκκλησιαστικὸν καὶ χάριτος ἄξιον ὑποκείμενον ἐκεῖνο, τὸ ὁποῖον εἶχε δυνηθῇ νὰ προβιβάζῃ, ἐν τοῖς τόποις τούτοις τὴν Σύστασιν ἐνὸς ἔργου τόσοῦ ἀγαθοποιοῦ πρὸς τὸ ἀνθρώπινον γένος, καὶ ν' ἀποδείξῃ, μετ' εὐφραδείας, πολὺ μαθείας ἅμα καὶ ἀληθείας, τὰ μέγιστα πραγματικὰ ἀγαθὰ του, ἔπρεπε νὰ παρακαλεσθῇ, νὰ γένῃ ὁ Πρόεδρος τῆς Ἑταιρίας.

Ὅλοι οὖν ἀπεδέχθησαν μὲ ἐνθουσιασμὸν τὸ πρόβλημα τοῦτο, καὶ τὸ ἐνέκριναν παμφηρεῖ. Ὁ δὲ Βαρὼν Θεοτόκης, ἐψηφίσθη μετὰ τοῦτο Πρόεδρος τῆς Γραφικῆς Ἰωνικῆς Ἑταιρίας.

Ἡ Ἑψηλότης του μετὰ τοῦτο ἐξέθηκεν εὐσήμως τὴν βαθεῖαν εὐγνωμοσύνην, τὴν ὁποίαν διηγείρεν εἰς τὴν ψυχὴν του μία τόσοσιν ἐκουσία καὶ ἐντιμὸς συναίνεσις, εἰπὼν πρὸς τοὺτοις ὅτι ἐὰν ὁ πόθος τῶν Ἑταίρων ἔμελλε νὰ νομισθῇ χαριστικὸς ὡς πρὸς τὰ μέσα τοῦ νοός του, ἦτον ὁμῶς δικαιοτάτος ὡς πρὸς τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς του κλίσιν.

We have now only to give an extract or two from the concluding speech of the President, part of which is published at VOL. XXV. Cl. JI. NO. XLIX. I

length. His general view of the constitution of Bible Societies is thus expressed :

Ἡ ἐξουσία καὶ τὸ κύρος τῆς Γραφικῆς Ἑταιρίας δὲν ἤθελεν κάμει ὑπερήφανον, μήτε τὸν ἐνεργοῦντα αὐτὴν, μήτε ἤθελε ταπεινώσει τὸν ὑποτασσόμενον εἰς αὐτήν. Αὐτὴ οὐσα ἀνεξάρτητος, ὅσον ἀρκεῖ, ἀπὸ κοσμικὴν προσωποληψίαν, διὰ νὰ μὴ παρεμποδίζηται εἰς τὴν ἐνέργειαν καὶ ἐκπλήρωσιν τῶν μεγάλων ὑποθέσεών της, καὶ συνημμένη, ὅσον ἰκανὸν εἶναι, μὲ τὰς Πολιτικὰς Κοινωνίας, διὰ νὰ συντηρῇ μετ' αὐτῶν μίαν ἀγίαν ἀδελφικὴν οἰκειότητα, θέλει ἐκβάλλει μίαν ἀρμοδίαν φωνήν, διὰ νὰ ἐνθαρρύνῃ, καὶ φωτίσῃ πάντα Χριστιανὸν, καὶ διὰ νὰ τὸν κάμει μέτοχον τῶν εὐφραντικῶν ἀγώνων καὶ σπουδῶν, τῶν τιμῶν, καὶ τῆς εὐνίκης μερίμνης τῆς ἐνδόξου καὶ λαμπρᾶς ὑπουργίας της.

He then descants a little on the advantages which his countrymen enjoy under the protection ἐνὸς γενναῖα εὐφροῦς καὶ ἐπιεικοῦς Ἑθνους, and thus addresses them :

Εὐτυχεῖς ἐγκαίτοιχοι τοῦ Κράτους τούτου ! ἐν ᾧ ὁ Θεὸς σᾶς προκαταλαμβάνει μὲ τὰς χάριτάς του καὶ εὐλογίας, καὶ μὲ τὰ δῶρα τῆς φύσεως : ἐν ᾧ ἡ ἀφαιτοῦς αὐτοῦ ἀγαθότης σᾶς κατατάσσει ὑπὸ τὴν κραταίαν αἰγίδα ἐνὸς μεγαλοφύχου Μονάρχου, ὅστις σᾶς ἐντυποῖ ἓνα χαρακτῆρα μεγαλειότητος καὶ ἀνεξαρτησίας δι' οὗ σᾶς ἀποκαθιστᾷ εὐσήμες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

In the peroration he enlarges on the beneficial operations of religion, in the following terms :

Ἡ Θρησκεία μᾶς ὁδηγεῖ μετὰ συνέσεως, καὶ μᾶς κατευθύνει εἰς τὴν φυσικὴν ἡμῶν κλίσιν :—Αὐτὴ ἐργάζεται μίαν ἀένναον ἔκχυσιν ἀγαθῶν, χωρὶς ποτὲ νὰ πτωχεύῃ—πονεῖ μὲν αἰεὶ, ἀλλὰ ποτὲ δὲν ἀποκάμνει—προνοεῖ διὰ τὰ παραμικρά, ὡς καὶ διὰ τὰ μεγαλῆτερα πράγματα—μᾶς καθιστάνει αἰσθητικὸς πρὸς τὰς τालαιπωρίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ μᾶς παρηγορεῖ μὲ ἀόκνον προθυμίαν, ἀνταμείβει τὰς ἀρετάς μας, διεγείρουσα εἰς τὴν ψυχὴν μας μίαν ἀνεξάντλητον ἀγαλλίασιν, καὶ παιδεύει τὸ ἐλαττώμα μας πληθύνοντα τοὺς ἐλέγχους τῆς συνειδήσεώς μας—αὐτὴ μόνη μᾶς διδάσκει νὰ ὑποφέρωμεν πάσχοντες, καὶ νὰ ἀποθνήσκωμεν—αὐτὴ δύναται νὰ καλεσθῇ ὁ ἄξων ἐκεῖνος, ἐφ' ᾧ περιστρέφεται ἡ εὐημερία τῶν Ἑθνῶν καὶ τῶν Κρατῶν—αὐτὴ μᾶς ὑποτάσσει εἰς ἓν ἀγαπητὸν καὶ ἐλπιτὸν σκῆπτρον—εἰς τοῦτο μόνον ἀσθενεῖ εἰς τὸ νὰ μὴν ἀπατᾷ κἀνένα ποτὲ—πρὸς αὐτὴν καὶ μόνην ὀφείλομεν τὸν καλὸν Πολίτην, τὰς καλὰς Ἀρχὰς καὶ ἐξουσίας, τὸν καλὸν Πατέρα, τὸν καλὸν ἀδελφόν, τὸ καλὸν τέκνον, τὸν καλὸν Ἰππῆκοον, τὸν καλὸν Βασιλέα, τὸν καλὸν φίλον, τὴν σώφρονα σύζυγον, τὸν ἀδιάφρακτον κριτὴν, τὸν Προστάτην τῶν χερῶν, καὶ τὸν Ὑπερασπιστὴν τῶν Ὀρφανῶν—ἀπὸ αὐτὴν μόνην προκύπτει ἡ ἀνακούφισις τοῦ τालαιπῶρου πένητος, ἐκείνη ἡ θερμότης πίστεως, ἥτις μᾶς συνάπτει μὲ τὰς παρὰ Θεοῦ ἀποκαλυφθεῖσας ἀληθείας, ἐκείνη ἡ ἀσφαλὴς πεῖρα, ἥτις μᾶς κάμνει νὰ ἐλπίζωμεν ἀχαμμένοντες τὰ ὅσα ἀγαθὰ μᾶς ὑποσχέθη ὁ Θεός, ἐκείνη ἡ ἀμοι-

βαία ἀγάπη, ἐκεῖνο τὸ θεῖον πῦρ τὸ ὁποῖον περιφλέγει τὰς ψυχὰς ἡμῶν, καὶ εἶναι ἡ ἰσχυρωτέρα ἀπάσης ἄλλης ἀρχῇ ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, διὰ τὸν φέρη εἰς μόνιμον εὐδαιμονίαν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, καὶ εἰς αἰδίων καὶ μακαρίαν ἀναγέννησιν ἐν Οὐρανῷ.

After this specimen of Ionian Senatorial eloquence, the Report proceeds to detail the plan intended to be adopted in the establishment of various depôts for the supply of the Scriptures at the most moderate prices, and for gratuitous distribution to those who have not the means of purchase. It concludes with an appeal to the clergy on behalf of the Society.

Τὸ Ἱερατεῖον κατ' ἐξοχὴν θέλει λάβῃ ἀναμφιβόλως μεγίστην χαρὰν διὰ τὴν σύστασιν τῆς ἐν τῷ Ἰονίῳ γραφικῆς Ἑταιρίας. Τὸ Ἐφορεῖον ἐλπίζει, ὅτι τὸ Ἱερατεῖον αὐτὸ θέλει μὲ πολλὰ περισσότεραν εὐκολίαν ὠφελήσῃ διὰ τοιαύτης ἀνακαλύψεως καὶ φανερώσεως τῆς Θεϊκῆς προνοίας, τὴν Λογικὴν του Ποίμνην, καὶ τὰ σχολεῖα τῶν Ἑνοριῶν του, μὲ Ἀντίτυπα διαλαμβάνοντα τὸν Λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἵνα ὅλοι ὅσοι ἐξέδρουν ἢ ἀναγινώσκωσι, καὶ δύνανται νὰ ἐννοῶσιν, ὑπάρχωσιν εἰς κατάρασιν νὰ διδάσκωνται ἀπ' ἐαυτῶν τὰς ἀληθείας τοῦ ἀγίου Εὐαγγελίου, καὶ οὕτω νὰ γίνωνται εὐσεβεῖς καὶ ἀξιολύμητοι Χριστιανοί, ἐνάρετοι καὶ φιλόστοργοι γονεῖς, φρόνιμοι καὶ εὐπειθεῖς παῖδες, φιλόπονοι καὶ πιστοὶ ὑπῆκοοι, καὶ τίμια μέλη τῆς πολιτικῆς κοινωνίας, ἀγωνιζόμενοι ἕκαστος νὰ ἐκπληροῖ ἐν καθαρᾷ συνειδήσει τὰ χρέη τῆς ἐν τῇ ζωῇ ταύτῃ καταστάσεώς τε, ἐν ᾗ κατετάχθη παρὰ τῆς Θεϊκῆς Προνοίας.

For the entertainment of your readers I subjoin a list of the Vice-Presidents and other officers of the Institution; among whom may perhaps be discovered a few English friends, concealed under the majestic disguise which the courtesy of Greece has thrown around them.

ἙΠΙΤΡΟΠΕΙΑ ΤΗΣ ἸΟΝΙΚΗΣ ἙΤΑΙΡΕΙΑΣ ΤΗΣ ἘΠΙ ΤΗΣ ἹΕΡΑΣ ΓΡΑΦΗΣ.

Πρόεδρος,

Βαρὼν Ἑμμανουὴλ Θεοτόκης.

Ἀντιπρόεδροι,

Ἐπίσκοπος Μακάριος, Τοποτηρητὴς Κερκύρας.

Ἐυγενὴς Ἰωάννης Καππάδοκας.

Σὲρ Φεδερίκος Ἀνκεῆς.

Ἰππεὺς Στάμος Χαλκιόπουλος.

Κόμης Νικόλαος Ἀνινος.

Κόμης Δημήτριος Φοσκάρης.

Ἐυγενὴς Φελλήζης Ζαμπέλλης.

Ἐυγενὴς Βασίλειος Ζαβός.

Τίμιος Κάρολος Πέρσης.

Τίμιος Ἰωάννης Μέτσοβ.

Τίμιος Γεράλδ Δε Κουρσῆς.

Κυβερνηταί.

Πανοσιώτατος Γεώργιος Κασσιμάτης.

Πανοσιώτατος Χρύσανθος Μασσέλλος.

Ῥοβέρτος Φόρες, Σκουδιέρος.

Ἐυγενῆς Πέτρος Χοϊδᾶς.

Ἐυγενῆς Ἰάκωβος Χαλικιόπουλος Μάντζαρος.

Ἰππεὺς Ἀντώνιος Θ. Λευκόκυιλος.

Ἐυγενῆς Σπυρίδων Παπαδόπουλος.

Ἐυγενῆς Στέλλιος Βλασσόπουλος.

Πανοσιώτατος Πολύκαρπος Κὸς Βούλγαρης.

Ἰατρὸς Πόρτους.

Σοφολογιάτατος Ἀνδρέας Ἱερεὺς Ἰδρομένος.

Γουλλιέλμος Τζέημς, Σκουδιέρος.

Θησαυροφύλαξ.

Ἰωσήφ Κατράνης, Σκουδιέρος.

Γραμματεῖς.

Πανοσιώτατος Γεώργιος Οὐίνωκ.

Ἐυγενῆς Ἀνδρέας Θεοτόκης.

Ἐυγενῆς Δημήτριος Ζερβός.

Now really, Sir, on a view of the whole, this document appears to me in no ordinary degree interesting. If ever the Greeks are to awake out of their long sleep, surely the prevalence and diffusion of such sentiments as those which we have here before us, must effect such a resuscitation; or rather they are indications that it is now actually taking place. Christianity is, after all, the great agent in civilisation, and is equally effective in developing and bringing into action the dormant energies of a once polished and powerful, but now degraded, people. It seems quite impossible for a man to imbibe the spirit of that religion, and not to feel that he is gifted with the noblest powers, that they may be employed for the noblest ends; not to be sensible that he is intrusted with talents to be laid out for the benefit of himself and his fellow-creatures, with a certainty that, in the event of their misapplication, he must one day be called to a fearful account. But when, in addition to general obligations, such large and noble schemes of philanthropy are entertained and encouraged as we find here proposed, what can result but effects the most enlivening and elevating? Add to all this, the conviction of the benefits of education, and the just conceptions of social and civil duties which are here exhibited, and we have almost every feature before us of the noblest character of man.

Another circumstance, which appears to me extremely pleasing, is the spirit of unity and conciliation which breathes throughout this composition. When we look back upon the history of the Greek Church, and the interminable disputes and controversies which have distracted it; when we reflect that the history of the Greeks as a Christian nation is scarcely any thing but the enumeration of a series of religious quarrels and wars, that there is scarcely a distinguishing appellation of any sect or party which does not bear the marks of its Grecian origin, the Homœousians and the Homoiousians, the Monothelites and the Monophysites, with all their endless divisions and subdivisions—after all this, I say, it is really refreshing and cheering to hear Greeks eulogising the system of Bible Societies, because by it *ἅπαντες οἱ Χριστιανοὶ ὅποιασδήποτε ἐκκλησίας δύνανται νὰ ἐνωθῶσιν*, and to find them exemplifying the influence of these sentiments in the harmonious proceedings of a meeting, and that a religious meeting, composed of men of various nations and of every religious communion.

In these remarks I may be considered to involve, in some degree, the cause of the Bible Society. Really, Sir, I am no divine; and far be it from me to attempt to satisfy the doubts and remove the difficulties which pious and learned men have started on this subject; yet I must own that if by an institution kindred to itself, the Bible Society has been instrumental in exciting or cherishing something of such a spirit as we have been contemplating in any nation, and most of all, in that of the Greeks, it is engaged in a labour in which one might be well disposed to envy its members their occupation.

ΠΑΡΤΑΙΕΤΣ.

P. S. Should any of your classical readers be entirely unacquainted with modern Greek, it may be worth while just to observe, that

να (from *ινα*) signifies “that,” conjunction.

μας (*ημας*) “us,” “our.”

σας “you,” “your.”

δεν the negative particle, “not.”

με is for *μετα*,

and the verbs *θελω* and *εχω* are used as auxiliaries in the same way as our English “will” and “have.”

These remarks being kept in mind, there will be little difficulty in reading the quotations which we have given.

OBSERVATIONS ON

PROFESSOR COUSIN'S Edition of the COMMENTARIES of PROCLUS on the First Alcibiades of Plato, in 2 Vols. 8vo. Paris, 1820 and 1821; and also on CREUZER'S Edition of the same COMMENTARIES, together with those of Olympiodorus on that Dialogue, in 2 Vols. 8vo. Francof. 1820 and 1821.

No. I.

THE lovers of the Platonic philosophy, who at the present period, and especially in this country, are very rare, will certainly acknowledge themselves to be much indebted to the labors of Professor Cousin¹ and Creuzer, for publishing these remains of the Commentaries of two of the best disciples of Plato, on one of the most important of all the Dialogues of that prince of philosophers. For what can be more important to man, than the knowledge of what man is? which in these Commentaries is unfolded with the most consummately scientific skill, and in a way which, by the Platonic reader, will be considered as no less luminous than acute.

The merits of these two editions of the Commentaries of Proclus are nearly equal. For though Creuzer consulted a greater number of manuscripts than Cousin, with the different readings of which he has enriched his notes, yet the text of the latter is far more accurate than that of the former; and, besides this, the Professor's edition is accompanied by Gogava's Latin translation of a part of these Commentaries, and by the Epitome made of them by Ficinus; so that to the reader who is not an adept in the philosophy of Plato, the edition of Cousin is the most valuable, and to the critic that of Creuzer.

As the Harleian manuscript of these Commentaries of Proclus, of which I have a copy, appears to me to be on the whole superior to any of those consulted by Cousin and Creuzer; (for it contains nearly all the accurate readings noticed by the latter of these editors, and has some which are not to be found in other copies;) my remarks will be the result of a comparison

¹ See the Remarks on the Professor's edition of the two first books of Proclus on the Parmenides of Plato, in the preceding Number of this Journal.

of the readings of this manuscript with those from which these two very able and laudable scholars formed their editions.

In Tom. ii. p. 6. of Cousin, and p. 3. of Creuzer, we have *Διο νου μεν εστιν εν αιωνι το τελειον*, κ. τ. λ.; but for *Διο* the Harleian MS. has *δια τουτο*, which I prefer, as being more conformable to the manner of Proclus. In p. 14. of Cousin, after *και που φησομεν ουτως αλλαχου δεικνυσθαι την ουσιαν ημων ητις εστιν*; the words, *που δε τον ανθρωπον εξητησθαι και την ανθρωπου φυσιν*, immediately follow, and so likewise in the Harleian MS.; but they are not in the text of Creuzer, nor are they mentioned by him in his notes. In p. 9. of Creuzer, after the words, *ωσπερ ουν ενταις τελεταις καθαρσεις ηγουνται και περιρραντηρια και αγνισμοι α των εν απορρητοις δρωμενων και της του θεου μετουσιαις*, the words *γυμνασματα ειναι* are wanting, which, however, the Harl. MS. has, and also the text of Cousin, as may be seen in p. 22. of his edition. Creuzer in his notes observes. that the manuscripts A. F. B. and D. have these words, and that they are also to be found, together with the whole passage, in an English Treatise entitled, A Dissertation on the Eleusinian and Bacchic Mysteries. Amsterd. sine anni nota; which treatise was one of my juvenile productions. P. 11. of Creuzer, and p. 26. of Cousin: *ταυτα δε περι της προθεσεως ημιν αναγεγραφθω προαποδειξασιν*; but the Harleian MS. for *προαποδειξασιν* has *προ αποδειξεσιν*, which is evidently erroneous. P. 14. of Creuzer: *πως ουν φαμεν τον διαλογον εις τα προσεχη και κυριωτερα μερη διαιρεισθαι*; and this is also the reading of Cousin: but the Harleian MS. has *παντα ουν φαμεν*, κ. τ. λ. and the sentence is not interrogative. The true reading, however, is evidently that of the editors: for the sentence that immediately follows, viz. *πως δε αλλως η επειδη σκοπος μεν εστιν αυτω κ. τ. λ.*, is obviously an answer to the preceding interrogation. In the same page of Creuzer, and also in p. 38. of Cousin, we have, *τρια τοιουν ταυτα του προκειμενου διαλογου μερη τα δε αλλα παντα τουτων ενεκα παραλαμβανεται και προς ταυτα συντελει, τα τε αποδεικτικα, και τα λεκτικα καθηκοντα*; except that Cousin for *τα λεκτικα* has *τα τω λεκτικω*, and Creuzer in his notes observes that the MSS. A. B. and D. have *τα τη λεκτικη*. But the Harleian MS. has *τα τη διαλεκτικη*, which appears to me to be the true reading.

Again, Cousin, p. 50. *το γαρ εξεταζειν την αιτιαν δι' ην ο Σωκρατης μονος των εραστων ουκ απεληξε του ερωτος, αλλα και ηρξατο προ των αλλων, και πεπαυμενων εκεινων ουκ απαλλαττεται, θεατην αυτον αποφαινει της ολης του Σωκρατους ζωης*. This is also the reading of the Harl. MS. and is correct; but the text of Creu-

zer omits *εκεινων*; nor is the omission mentioned by him in his notes, though I wonder this very learned man did not see the necessity of inserting it. Creuzer p. 45. *και ολας το αμεθεκτον ετερον εστι του μεθεκτου, και το καθ' αυτο του μετ' αλλου συνθεωρουμενου, και το εξημμενον του προς ετερον τινα συνταξιν λαχοντος.* So the Harl. MS. and so Cousin. But for *εξημμενον* in this passage it is requisite to read *εξηρημενον*. For then Proclus will say, "And, in short, the imparticipable is different from the participable, that which subsists by itself, from that which is surveyed in conjunction with something else, and *that which is exempt*, from *that which is allotted a co-arrangement with a certain other thing.*" And in the words that immediately follow in Creuzer, viz. *Επειδη τοιουν ο Αλκιβιαδης νοειται διχως και ως ψυχη, καθοσον μεν εστι ψυχη του νου σωζει προς αυτον αναλογιαν ο Σωκρατης, καθοσον δε σωματι χρωμενη ψυχη, την του αγαθου δαιμονος,* there are wanting the words *και ως ψυχη σωματι χρωμενη*, between the words *και ως ψυχη*, and the word *καθοσον*, which are also wanting in the Harl. MS., but which are very properly inserted in the edition of Cousin, p. 121. In p. 51. of Creuzer, Proclus speaking of the summit of the intelligible triad, which consists of *being, life, and intellect*, says, "that it is characterised by *the good*, which it intellectually perceives, where according to the oracle *the paternal monad* resides," *της μεν πρωτης τω αγαθω χαρακτηριζομενης, ταγαθον αυτο νοουσα, οπου πατριχη μονας εστι, το λογιον φησι.* Creuzer in his note on this passage observes, "*Voces extremas: οπου πατριχη μονας εστι, ut ex Psello depromtas, quasi primum oraculorum Zoroastris versum edidit F. Patricius. Vid. Clerici Opera Philos. p. 304.;*" by which it appears that this most learned man was not at the time of his writing this acquainted with my collection of the Chaldean Oracles,¹ published in the Classical Journal. (See Nos. 29. 32. and 33.) For he would there have seen the whole of the Oracle of which these words are the conclusion, and the source whence it was derived, which is the 2nd book of Proclus on Euclid p. 27., and is mentioned by that philosopher as follows: *και γαρ η μονας εκει πρωτον, οπου πατριχη μονας εστι, φησι το λογιον.*

In p. 52. of Creuzer, Proclus speaking still further of the

¹ The reader will see that in this collection each Oracle is accurately arranged under its proper head, and the authors and places given (a few only excepted) where each may be found. And he will likewise find that the collection of Patricius is there increased by the addition of upwards of fifty Chaldean Oracles, and fragments of Oracles.

intelligible triad, says : και η τριας αυτη προεισιν εντευθεν επι παντας τους θειους διακοσμους, και πασιν επιλαμπει την προς το νοητον ενωσιν. Αλλως δε κατ' αλλας εκφαινεται ταξεις δυναμεις. But the Harleian MS. very properly adds, after the word ταξεις, the words ταις ιδιοτησι των θεων συμπλεκουσα τας εαυτης. And this addition is also to be found in the text of Cousin p. 141. ; but does not appear to have been in any of the manuscripts consulted by Creuzer, or he would doubtless have noticed it. In the same page, Proclus cites the following Chaldaic Oracle :

παντα γαρ εν τρισι τοις δε κυβερνεται τε και εστιν.

i. e. " For all things are governed by and subsist in these three ;" i. e. in *faith, truth, and love* ; of which he had been before speaking. And Creuzer in a note says, " Hoc λογια augeri possunt τα του Ζωροαστρου λογια, quæ post Fr. Patricium et Th. Stanlejum edidit Jo. Clericus, &c." But it was many years ago published by me in the before-mentioned collection of Chaldean oracles. Creuzer adds, " Ceterum his Platoniorum philosophorum oraculis oraculum aliud in hac ipsa quæstione opponit scriptor anonymus in Cod. Darinstad. mscg.—εκ μεν γαρ αρχης παντα γεγεννηται ως τα ιερα φασί λογια και ουχ ετερον αφ' ετερου ως τα Πορφυριου και Ιαμβλιχου ληρουσι περι των προοδων συνταγματα. It is singular that so learned a man as Creuzer should not have discovered that this anonymous writer means by τα ιερα λογια the Scriptures, and that consequently he is not quoting any heathen oracle. For that this writer was a Christian, is evident from his calling the theory of Porphyry and Iamblichus about the progression of the divine orders delirious. In thus defaming, however, the theological dogma of these great men, this anonymous author has only exposed his own ignorance of the Platonic theology, for, according to this theology, the great first cause of all energises prior to, together with, and posterior to, all the other causes that proceed from him, as is demonstrated by Proclus in his Elements of Theology. So that though one thing proceeds from another, an inferior from a superior principle, yet all things originally proceed from the first principle, who is therefore called in this Theology the Principle of principles, the God of Gods, and a unity prior to all things.

In p. 71 of Creuzer, Proclus, after speaking about the order of dæmons in common, adds : των γαρ δαιμονων τουτων κατα το μεσον, ως ειπομεν, τεταγμενων, οι μεν πρωτιστοι θειοι δαιμονες εισι, κ. τ. λ. But after πρωτιστοι the Harl. MS. adds και ακροτατοι, and Cousin also, p. 193, has this addition ; though it does not appear to have been found in any of the MSS. consulted by

Creuzer. Again, Creuzer p. 74. and Cousin p. 201. οὕτω γὰρ οἶμαι, καὶ ὁ ἐν Πολιτείᾳ Σωκράτης δαιμόνας ἐκάλεσε τοὺς εὐ βεβιωκότας καὶ ἐς ἀμείνω λήξιν μεταστάντας καὶ τοπὸν ἀγίωτερον. But for μεταστάντας the Harl. MS. has καταστάντας, and for τοπὸν ἀγίωτερον, τοποὺς ἀγίωτερους. And the latter appears to have been the reading which Ficinus found in his MS.; for his version of this passage is: “Hac arbitror ratione Socratem in Republica dæmonias animos appellasse qui vitam bene transegerint et in meliorem translati sint sortem *locaque augustiora jam colant.*” Instead of τὸν ἐρωτᾷ τὸν θεῖον, and πραγμασίῃ ἀνορθοῦ in p. 80. of Creuzer, and p. 211. of Cousin, the Harl. MS. has τὸν δαίμονα τὸν θεῖον, and πραγμασίῃ ἀνωθεν, but erroneously. In p. 82. of Creuzer, Proclus, speaking of the different powers possessed by different dæmons, says: Μείζονας δὲ ἐτι λέκτεον, ὅτι τῶν δαιμόνων οἱ μὲν καθαρτικὴν ἐλάχον δύναμιν καὶ ἀχραντόν, οἱ δὲ γεννητικὴν, οἱ δὲ δημιουργικὴν κ. τ. λ. But the Harl. MS. after οἱ δὲ γεννητικὴν adds οἱ δὲ τελεσιουργόν; and this addition is also in Cousin p. 215., but does not appear to have been in the MSS. of Creuzer. It is however very properly inserted; for the telesurgic power of dæmons is often celebrated by Proclus and other Platonists, and Ficinus also appears to have found these words in his MS.; for his version of this passage is: “Præterea dæmonum alii purgatoriam et incontaminabilem possident potestatem, alii vero genitricem, alii *perfectoriam*, &c.” Creuzer p. 85. ἐκεῖνη δὲ ἀκραιφνὴς προὔπαρχει καὶ δραστηρίως προ τῶν παρ’ ἡμῖν θαυμάζομενων. But the Harl. MS. and also Cousin p. 219. have very properly δυνάμεων after θαυμάζομενων. In p. 87. of Creuzer, and p. 223. of Cousin, for πῶς δὲ οὐχ ὀρωμεν ὅτι πολλὰ καὶ τῶν τοῖς χείροσιν ἡμῶν ἐς γνῶσιν ἀδυνάτων ἡμῖν ἐστὶν εὐγνώστα; the Harl. MS. has πῶς δὲ οὐχ ὀρωμεν ὅτι πολλὰ καὶ ζωντῶς χείροσιν ἡμῶν κ. τ. λ. And immediately after in Creuzer for καθ’ ὅλον in the sentence τὴν γὰρ τῶν καθ’ ὅλον φύσιν τὰ μὲν ἀλόγα γινώσκειν οὐ πέφυκεν, ἡμεῖς δὲ συναίρειν δυνάμεθα, the Harl. MS. and also Cousin have very properly καθόλου. For irrational animals have no knowledge of *universals*, but we have.

Again, in p. 91. of Creuzer, and p. 228. of Cousin, the Harl. MS. has ἀπολαβεῖν instead of ἀπολαύειν in the following passage: καὶ ὥσπερ ἥλιος ἀφίησι τὸ φῶς οὐ διωρισμένως, ἀλλὰ πασι τοῖς δυνάμενοις ἀπολαύειν, μετεχειν δὲ ὁ δυνάμενος. In p. 93. of Creuzer in the following passage, διὰ δὲ τὴν τοῦ προνοουμένου φύσιν εὐμεταβολὸν οὖσαν ἀμφιβολίας ἐνδεικτικόν, the Harl. MS. and also Cousin p. 231. have rightly ἐστὶν after ἀμφιβολίας. In the following passage in p. 100. of Creuzer, and p. 241. of Cousin, viz. Ἀλλὰ τι, φαίης ἂν, ὁ Σωκράτης εἰς ἐπαινον καθίησι τοῦ νεανίσκου, the Harl. MS. has καθίστησιν for καθίησι. In p. 103.

of Creuzer in the following passage, Προστίθῃσι γὰρ οὐκ ἔστι τὰ ἀναγκαῖα τῶν ἀρετῶν καὶ τὰ ἐπομείνα τῶν ἡγουμένων, for προστίθῃσι, which is also the reading of the Harl. MS., it is requisite to substitute προτίθῃσι, as in the text of Cousin p. 245. For Proclus is speaking of the absurdity of him who fancies that his proper good originates from the body, and not from the soul, and very justly observes that such a one prefers the necessities [of the animal life] to virtue, and things that rank as consequent to those that have a precedency and a leading order. Again in p. 104. of Creuzer, and p. 246. of Cousin, Proclus speaking of the το αὐταρκές, or *that which is sufficient to itself*, observes, ὅτι το αὐταρκές πρῶτως ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐστὶ τοῖς θεοῖς· ἀγαθοὶ γὰρ εἰσιν οἱ θεοὶ, καὶ ἀγαθοτήτος ὑπερουσίοι, καὶ πληρωμάτων τῶν ὄντων ἀπαντῶν. So likewise the Harl. MS. But for ἀγαθοτήτος it is necessary to read ἀγαθοτήτες: for the Gods are every where celebrated by Proclus as ἀγαθοτήτες ὑπερουσίοι; because, according to the Platonic theology, every effect is *secondarily* what its cause is *primarily*. Hence as the first God is τ' ἀγαθόν, *the good*, all the other Gods are ἀγαθοτήτες, *goodnesses*; conformably to which Simplicius in Epictet. calls the supreme principle of all things ἀγαθοτῆς ἀγαθοτήτων. Ficinus also in his version of this part evidently found in his MS. ἀγαθοτήτες. For his translation is, "Ipsa per se sufficientia primum est penes Deos. Boni namque sunt Dii, atque superessentiales bonitates quædam, et entium omnium plenitudines." With respect to the word πληρωμα, which is so frequently employed by Proclus in his Theology of Plato and other works, and is used by other Platonists, it accurately signifies *a whole which gives completion to the universality of things*. In p. 107. of Creuzer, and p. 250. of Cousin, in the following passage: τι γὰρ ἄλλο διὰ τῆς προσθήκης ἐνδείκνυται ταύτης, ἢ ὅτι οἶει μὲν, οὐ μὲντοι ἔχει ταῦτα οὕτως; so also the Harl. MS. But for οὕτως here, it is necessary to read ὁντως. For Proclus had just before informed us, that the word οἶει employed by Socrates in his conference with Alcibiades, is a sufficient indication of false opinion. Hence he adds: "what else is indicated by this addition than that Alcibiades *falsely* opined indeed that he possessed these things, [i. e. the greatest beauty and power,] but that he did not possess them *in reality*?" In p. 120. l. 20. of Creuzer, for ἐπιμελουμένη, the Harl. MS. has ἐπιτελουμένη, which I prefer; and this is also the reading of Cousin p. 270. In p. 123. of Creuzer, and p. 274. of Cousin, Proclus speaking of the participation of intelligible essences observes, Κωλύει γὰρ ἐπὶ τούτων (i. e. τῶν νοητῶν) τὴν μεταδοσιν μόνῃ ἢ τῶν ἐπιδεχομένων ἀνεπιτηδεύουσι, ἐπεὶ τὰ γὰρ μεταδιδόντα αἰεὶ δίδωσι καὶ πανταχοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοίως. But for τὰ γὰρ μεταδιδόντα in this passage, the Harl. MS.

has τα γενητα δωσοντα. The former, however, appears to me to be the true reading. Instead of τελειον μενον in p. 129. l. 21. of Creuzer, the Harl. MS. has τελειουμενον, which is the true reading, and is conjectured to be so by Creuzer. For he says in his notes, "Mendum esse suspicor in hac periodo. An leg. τελειουμενον?" And Cousin has in his text (p. 284.) τελουμενον.

In the words Ουτω τοινυν και ο Σωκρατης κατα τον του θειου ζηλον κ. τ. λ. p. 131. of Creuzer, and p. 286. of Cousin, the Harl. MS. for τον του θειου ζηλον has τον θειον ζηλον, which is doubtless the true reading. In p. 133. of Creuzer, and p. 288. of Cousin, in the following passage, Διοτι δε ο Σωκρατης τολμα την εαυτου διανοιαν φραζειν, κατεισιν εις υποδεεστεραν ενεργειαν της ενδον αυτω μενουσης, the Harl. MS. for τολμα την εαυτου διανοιαν φραζειν has τολμα την εαυτου διανοιαν. φραζει: but this is doubtless erroneous. In the following passage in the same page of Creuzer, viz. αλλ' ομως κατεισιν ο Σωκρατης ιν' ωσπερ Ηρακλης εξ Αιδου τον ερωμενον αναγη και πειση της μεν φαινομενης αποστήσαι ζωης, επι δε την νοεραν και θειαν αναδραμειν, αφ' ης και εαυτον γνωσεται, και το θειον ολον εξηρημενον των οντων απαντων, και αιτιον αυτω προϋπαρχον, the Harl. MS. has very properly εξηρημενον, for εξηρητημενον, and so likewise has Cousin p. 289. For nothing is more frequently asserted by Proclus, than that divinity is exempt from all beings. But if εξηρητημενον is retained, Proclus will be made to say, that divinity is suspended from all beings, than which nothing can be more absurd. I very much wonder, therefore, that the learned Creuzer should say in a note on this passage, "Cod. E. habet εξηρημενον pro εξηρητημενον. Perperam." P. 135. of Creuzer, λεγομεν, οτι μενουσαι μεν αι ψυχαι παρα τοις αυτοις νοερωσ ενεργουσι. But for τοις αυτοις the Harl. MS. has rightly τοις θεοις, and so likewise has Cousin p. 292. In p. 136. of Creuzer, and p. 293. of Cousin, Proclus says, Και ο λογος εστιν ο διαβαλλων επι νουν απ' ολισθησεως και φαντασιας; and this is also the reading of the Harl. MS. But for απ' ολισθησεως, I conceive it necessary to read απ' αισθησεως. In the same page, Proclus observes that souls in the present life pursue the images of the paradigms which they formerly surveyed in the intelligible world. Hence he says, Αλλαι μεν ουν των ψυχων αλλοις εισιν οικειαι θεαμασι· διο και αι μεν αλλοις, αι δε αλλοις ειδωλοις επιτρεχουσιν· ω γαρ ιδιον, εκει τα ειδωλα και τας σκιας φιλοφρονουνται. This is also the reading of the Harl. MS. But Cousin p. 293. for ω γαρ ιδιον has very properly ων γαρ ιδον. And this reading is confirmed by Ficinus' version of this passage, which is, "Aliæ namque animæ aliis sunt accommodatæ spectaculis, ideo aliæ aliis imaginibus incumbunt; eorum enim quæ illic inspexerant, similitudines amant."

Again, in the following passage in p. 146. of Creuzer, and p. 305. of Cousin, *Δεικνυται μεν ευθως εκ τούτων, οπόσον ην το διαφορον του τε Αλκιβιαδου και του θείου Σωκρατους ειπερ ο μεν εδειτο του γνωαι παρ' αυτου, τινα ελπιδα εχων υπομενει των αλλων αποφευγοτων εραστων.* But the Harl. MS. instead of *αποφευγοτων* has *αποφευγοντων*. Creuzer proposes to read *αποπεφευγοτων*, and Cousin has *αποφευγοντων*. The Harleian, however, appears to me to be the true reading; as doubtless the lovers of Alcibiades did not *openly*, but *secretly*, forsake him. In the following passage also in p. 149. of Creuzer, and p. 310. of Cousin, viz. *Εκει γαρ και ο μεγας ηγεμων Ζευς διακοσμων παντα και επιμελουμενης, ως φησιν ο εν Φαιδρω Σωκρατης,* the Harl. MS. after *παντα* adds *τα εν κοσμω ταις δυναμεσι*, which addition appears to be requisite. In p. 150. of Creuzer, l. 11. and p. 312. of Cousin, l. 12. for *οι θεουργοι*, the Harl. MS. has *οι θεολογοι*. And shortly after, to the words in Creuzer, *Και γαρ το διαπορθμιον ονομα το εν απειροις κοσμοις ενθρωςκον τοιαυτην ελαχε*, the Harl. MS. after *ελαχε* very properly adds *δυναμιν*, which is evidently wanting to the completion of the sentence, and is also in the text of Cousin. Again, in the following passage in p. 152. of Creuzer, *τον μεν γαρ παιδευοντα προσηκει τας των παιδευομενων επιτηδειοτητας ακριβων διαγινωσκειν*, the Harl. MS. has rightly *ακριβως* instead of *ακριβων*, and so likewise has the text of Cousin p. 314. Again, in p. 153. of Creuzer, and p. 316. of Cousin, Proclus speaking of what is requisite to be done by him who is properly instructed says, *τον δε παιδευομενον εαυτον επιδιδοναι προσηκει τω παιδευοντι, και ηρεμα περιαγεσθαι προς το αληθες των ειδωλων αφισταμενον, και απο του καταγειου σπηλαιου προς το φως και την οντως αυσιαν ανατεινομενον πανταχου της αμιγους προς το εναντιον και αφιεντα μεν το μεριστον και ειδωλικον, του δε καθ' ολου και αμεριστου τελειως ορεγομενον.* This is also the reading of the Harl. MS. except that it has rightly *καθολου* for *καθ' ολου*, as likewise the text of Cousin, who in a note after the words *προς το εναντιον* says, "*Hic nonnulla deesse videntur.*" To me also it appears that something is wanting in this passage, yet not after *εναντιον*; but I conceive that after *πανταχου*, the words *και επι της φυσικης* ought to be inserted. So that the whole passage will be in English: "But it is requisite that he who is instructed should deliver himself to his preceptor, and in a gradual circuitous course be led to the truth, separating himself from images, and every where extending from the subterranean cavern, to the light, and truly-existing being, and to a nature unmingled with its contrary; dismissing also that which is partible and pertaining to an image, but perfectly aspiring after that which is universal and impartic-

ble." In this passage also what Proclus says about being led to the light from the subterranean cave is derived from the 7th book of Plato's Republic.

ACCOUNT OF BARON NIEBUHR'S DISCOVERIES

IN THE VATICAN, AT ROME.

HAVING in No. 46. given a detailed account of M. Angelo Majo's discoveries in ancient Literature, we cannot do better than present to our readers the labors of M. Niebuhr in the same field. We have taken the following from the Literary Gazette, as containing the most detailed particulars we could collect:

Among the MSS. which made a part of the famous Palatine Library, given by the Duke of Bavaria to Gregory 15th, after the taking of Heidelberg, and united with that of the Vatican, there was one which for a long time was supposed, from its appearance, to contain only some books of the Old Testament. Jos. Blanchini made it known in this point of view. But in 1772, Paul Bruns and V. M. Giovenazzi discovered, under the MS. of the Sacred Books, other writing more ancient, from which they extracted a fragment of the 91st book of Livy, and they acknowledged that they had been able to read only a part of the writing, because it had been injured by washing and by time. This discovery gave great celebrity to the Palatine MS., and it had long been wished that some chemical process could be employed to revive the faded lines.¹ On the application of Baron Niebuhr, the Pontifical government permitted a trial to be made. M. Niebuhr has published a very curious work, containing the result of this trial, of which the following is an analysis.²—

M. N. gives a most detailed and perspicuous descrip-

¹ De Brosse's Hist. de la Rép. Romaine par Salluste T. i. p. 578, note.

² M. Tullii Ciceronis Orationum pro M. Fonteio et pro C. Rabirio fragmenta, T. Livii lib. XCI. fragmentum plenius et emendatius, I. Senecæ fragmenta, ex membranæ Bibliothecæ Vaticanæ, edita a B. C. Niebuhr, C. F. Romæ, 1820, in 8vo.

tion of the MS. He points out the primitive form of the leaves which compose it, their condition and their quality, as well as the manner in which they were folded when the volume was put together in its present form. From these circumstances he deduces, with much sagacity, the history of the volume; and after some remarks on the difficulty of fixing the age of MSS., he shows that the version of St. Jerome, which covers the ancient writing, must have been written in the 9th century on leaves of vellum, taken from several MSS. of a more ancient date, the character of which it was attempted to efface. 2. That in the sequel the book was much injured by the damp, which destroyed a part of it. 3. That towards the 11th century an attempt was made to repair the damage, by adding sheets of coarse vellum, written in characters analogous to those of that time.

The first fragments, rendered legible by the application of hydrosulphate of potash, belong to two works of Seneca, till then entirely unknown. They contain the commencement of the book "*De Vita Patris*," and three fragments of a treatise without title, but the subject of which seems to have been *friendship*. M. Niebuhr judges the writing to be of the beginning of the 6th century; and it is remarkable that Gaetano Migliore, in his edition of the fragment of Livy taken from the same MS., gives some parts of these writings of Seneca as being by Cicero.

Two leaves placed between those of Seneca, contain one hundred and sixty-two verses of Lucan, belonging to the 6th and 7th books of the *Pharsalia*. This may be considered, in M. Niebuhr's opinion, as the most ancient MS. of this poem, but not as one of the best.

In the third place, there are some lines of a Latin work on Mythology, and M. Niebuhr thinks they belong to the Fables of Hyginus, in their original state. It is known that this collection has come down to us very much impaired.

Two other pages, written in Greek, contain medicinal receipts. M. Niebuhr thinks he can recognise in them the Indian or Arabic figures which we now use; and he pointed them out to Professor Playfair, who was then at Rome. At the same time that we quote authorities of such high respectability, it must be added that M. Mai, who has since examined the same MS., has not been able to recognise in it these figures.

We shall say nothing of some pages, the writing in which

is so much injured, that there is no hope of making sense of it, but shall pass to the leaves containing the fragment of the 91st book of Livy. The beauty of the vellum and of the writing proves the great antiquity of the MS. of which they once made a part; and the breadth of the margin authorises us to believe that the Romans set as high a value on this species of luxury as modern Bibliomaniacs. M. Niebuhr declines fixing the age of the writing. He thinks that Paleography is an uncertain science, when it is not aided by historical data; and he shows that the same kind of writing was employed from the second century of the Christian era till the time of Charlemagne. He thinks, however, that the MS. of Livy was written before the fall of the Roman Empire in the West. I have already said, that the discovery of this fragment excited great attention half a century ago. Bruns published it at Hamburg, and Cancellieri, after Giovenazzi, at Rome! each of these editions became the source of several others, and of various translations. Some critics have combined in their editions and translations the two original reviews.

M. Niebuhr remarks, that the differences which exist between the editions of Giovenazzi and Bruns cannot fail to excite much surprise. The latter is the more complete; and the cause of the diversity is, that the friendship between these two literati having been a little impaired, Bruns kept secret the result of his later labors on the Vatican Manuscript.

The chemical means employed by Baron Niebuhr, and the extreme attention with which he has examined the MS., have enabled him to read two columns, which had almost wholly escaped the preceding editors; and, thanks to his care, the MS. of Livy has only very small breaks, which it has been easy to fill up.

Other leaves of this very singular volume contain fragments of the Orations of Cicero for Fonteius, for C. Rabirius, and for Sex. Roscius. They belonged to a MS. of a large size, and were folded, when they were taken to write on them the books of the Old Testament. In the time of Dante, the name of Cicero was celebrated; though, as M. Niebuhr observes, only a small part of his works was known. The prodigious activity which the Literati of the 15th century exerted in seeking for MSS. soon increased the number. Gherardo Landriani, bishop of Lodi, discovered several of Cicero's works on Rhetoric, and among the nu-

merous authors whom Poggio delivered from their prison,¹ both in France and Germany, the Roman Orator held the first rank by several of his harangues, with which the moderns were then for the first time made acquainted.² Of all the Orations of Cicero, that for Fonteius was the last discovered: it was found in a MS. which is still in the Archives of St. Peter's, but, from a remarkable ignorance, the copyist has intercalated a part of the Oration for Flaccus, and this mistake, while it has deprived us of a portion of one oration, has furnished the means to diminish the hiatus of another. The fragments of the Oration for Fonteius, discovered in the Palatine MS., were wholly unknown, and the Editor has placed at the head of them a learned preface, in which he inquires into the offices which Cicero's client filled, and the epochs at which he exercised the functions of them.

The fragments of the discourse for C. Rabirius are only partly new: the ancient MS. having been folded to form the present, the vellum has been cut, so that part of the lines has been taken off, and great skill was required to supply this loss. In the introduction M. Niebuhr brings forward two new ideas:—1st. He thinks that in the ancient MSS. the Orations of Cicero, which have not a collective title, were arranged in alphabetical order, according to the names of those in whose favor they were composed. 2dly. M. Niebuhr thinks it has been erroneously supposed, that the accusation, against which Cicero defended Rabirius, was that of treason, (*perduellio*,) whereas, in his opinion, it was a secondary, less serious accusation, renewed by Labienus, after the augur Metellus had hindered the voting of the people. Thus, while he acknowledges the antiquity of

¹ Poggii Orat. in funere Nic. Nicol. p. 275 Oper. edit. Basil. 1538, e *Germanorum Gallorumque ergastulis*.

² M. Niebuhr mentions, as a thing which is found only in the papers of Jerome Lagomarsini, a Note which is at the end of a MS. at Florence, and which certifies, that the Oration pro Cæcina was discovered by Poggio *Lingonum Sylvis*, meaning in the Abbey of Cluny in Burgundy. It is to be observed, however, that not only does Poggio speak in his letters of the Orations of Cicero, which he found there, (*Orationes Tulli quas detuli ex monasterio Cluniacensi*;) but that these discoveries, and expressly that of the Oration for Cæcina, are related from the Florence MSS. in many works on Literary History. (V. Laur. Mehus. præfat. ad Vit. Ambros. Camald. p. XXXV.—Bendini Cat. Cod. lat. Bibl. Laurent. T. ii. p. 311.—Shepherd's Life of Poggio.)

the title, *Pro C. Rabirio Perduellionis reo*, he thinks it should be changed into *Pro C. Rabirio ad Quirites*. I merely mention this opinion, without entering into an examination of its correctness, which does not seem to be demonstrated. The new fragment is the conclusion of the Oration for Rabirius, a defence which the Orator was obliged to finish in half an hour, and which he terminated by the following dignified expressions: *Dixi ad id tempus quod mihi a Tribuno plebis præstitutum est : a vobis peto quæsoque ut hanc meam defensionem pro amici periculo fidelem, pro reipublicæ salutem consularem putetis*. There is still a hiatus between what we already possessed, and what M. Niebuhr has discovered. The fragments of the Oration for Sex. Roscius adding nothing to what we already knew, they have merely furnished some various readings which may be of use.

Lastly, this MS., a singular union of so many illustrious remains, contains forty-four pages of the *Noctes Atticæ* of Aulus Gellius, which seem to merit but little attention, and which the work before us barely mentions.

Such are the results of M. Niebuhr's labor. His work is very properly divided into two parts; the first contains the description of the Palatine MS., the second is composed of the fragments of Cicero, Livy, Seneca, and Hyginus. Each of these is preceded by an introduction, and accompanied with critical and grammatical notes.

M. Angelo Mai has published some remarks on the fragments of Seneca: he frequently differs from the opinion of M. Niebuhr; but his criticism is always within the bounds of politeness, and has no object but the interest of learning.

This cannot be said of a letter dated Verona, but without the author's name, which has been inserted in the *Bibliotheca Italiana*. It is written in a manner very well calculated to disturb the harmony which ought to prevail among the learned, and which is so useful to the success of their studies. The anonymous author attacks all M. Niebuhr's writings; but he expresses himself with particular want of decorum with respect to a part of the preliminary discourse to the fragments of Cicero. In this part of his work, M. Niebuhr, to answer to the doubts expressed by M. Heinrich, endeavours to prove, that a change should be made in the arrangement of the fragments of the Oration for Scaurus, discovered some years ago by M. Mai. By a singular chance, M. Peyron has found at Turin a MS. from the

monastery of Bobbio, which contains the same fragments hidden under a work of Saint Augustine's, and which confirms the corrections proposed by M. Niebuhr. M. Peyron communicated his discovery to the Academy of Turin, on the 9th of April, 1820. The Piedmontese Gazette spoke of it two days afterwards. M. Niebuhr's work was not published till June, and the anonymous writer from Verona adduces these dates to accuse M. Niebuhr of having endeavoured to appropriate to himself the discovery made at Turin, and of having antedated his preface.

A man of letters like M. Niebuhr, who is known to be devoted to truth as the sole object of all his researches, might have despised such accusations. Full justice would have been done him. He has, however, thought fit to reply, by a letter to the Editor of the *Bibliotheca Italiana*, which was first published at Rome in French, 1st of December, 1820. In this letter, M. Niebuhr proves to demonstration, that his opinion of the order in which the fragments of the Oration for Scaurus should be arranged was formed as far back as 1815, and that he announced it at that time, in a Memoir read in the Berlin Academy: that the MS. of the work published by M. Niebuhr was delivered on the 25th of February, 1820, to the Master of the Sacred Palace, and that the sheet which contains his opinion on the fragments of Cicero was composed in the printing-office of De Romanis before the 18th of March. M. Mai himself, who has had some literary altercation with M. Niebuhr on the fragments of Cicero and Fronto, has been eager to recognise the justice of his claims.

The space to which this article has already extended does not allow of farther details respecting M. Niebuhr's letter, but it must be regretted that the learned sometimes suffer themselves to be led into discussions, which, far from being advantageous to letters, consume much valuable time, and lessen that serenity of mind which should be one of the recompenses of literary labors. It cannot be denied that the investigation of the remains of antiquity is extremely useful and interesting. The fragments published by M. Niebuhr are considerable of themselves, by their extent, and by the authors to whom they belong. They are instructive in many respects; they indicate new historical characters; they throw light on a law but little known, and on the manner in which the accounts of the administration were kept among the Romans. They men-

tion some works which no longer exist; and lastly, they are not without use for the topography of Rome. We should therefore rejoice at the discovery of the smallest remains of ancient authors, and encourage the publication of them. In general, their value cannot be estimated at the moment of their appearance. The fragment, which seems at first to be insignificant, may, in the sequel, clear up some important point of Philology, Grammar, or Antiquity. The Vatican Library, where the discoveries of which we have spoken were made, offers a vast field for research: the ardor of the Librarians and the Literati who are engaged in it assures us that their researches will be productive: an enlightened Government favors them, and this immense repository, now become accessible, can no more be compared, as it was by Lucas Holstenius, with the gardens of the Hesperides.

CRITICAL OBSERVATIONS

On the Appendixes to BURKHARDT'S Travels in Nubia.

WHEN we consider the high price of this valuable and interesting work, produced by the constant introduction in almost every page of the Arabic character, we cannot but regret, that some of the sentences in this character have been erroneously rendered into English, by those who directed the publication of it; and as some of those TRANSLATIONS are calculated to impede the progress of our acquaintance with the Arabic language of Africa if left unexplained, we presume the following observations will not be altogether uninteresting to an enlightened public, and to those who seek to improve general knowledge; particularly, when we consider the injury, which such erroneous translations are calculated to produce on the minds of persons learning the modern Arabic, and the impediments likely to be thrown in the way of African discoveries by such errors.

Appendix No. 1. page 477.

Itinerary from the frontiers of Bornou by Bahr el Ghazel and Dar Foor to Shendy, communicated to M. Burkhardt

at Mekka, by a Bedoween Arab of the tribe of Beni Hassan.¹

From this Itinerary, it appears that the immense population of the Empire of Bornou are for the most part Arabs,² stationary or Bedoween; the Bedoween tribes are the Beni Hassan, Abu Khedeer, together with many others who live in tented habitations, called Douars; the stationary are Dar Mandara and Dar Mekrèè, with many others; these live in walled habitations, as the word Dar implies.—The Bedoween never relinquishes his wandering for an agricultural life; but when a productive country presents itself to his occupation, he then contemplates cultivation, builds a house, which is called by his name, as *Dar Muhamed*, *Dar Aly*, &c., i. e. the house of Muhamed, of Aly, &c.; his brethren, or the individuals of his tribe, follow his example and build other houses near to his, and thus a town is quickly built, the collected habitations still retaining the original name of the first builder; for example³—*Dar Deleimy* was built by *Muhamed ben Deleimy*, the Sheick of Shtuka, and Khalif or Vice Roy of Suse; in the year 1790 and in 1794 when I was there, partaking of his munificent hospitalities, it contained 500 houses and nearly 5000 inhabitants, still, however, retaining the name of *Dar Deleimy*, i. e. the house of Deleimy; the same may be said of *Dar Foor*,

Dar Saley [*saleh* it should be صالح] and other Dars laid down in the maps of Africa.—The Bedoweens keep themselves an unmixed race, seldom intermarrying with the located Arabs; their language also is more pure; but the located Arabs

¹ An Emigration from this tribe of Arabs occupies a fine productive country in the Empire of Marocco: the populous town of Rabat is in this fertile province; see the Map of Marocco in Shabeeny's account of Timbuctoo, &c. page 55. Long. W. 5° 30'. Lat. N. 34° 40'.

² It appears from this report, confronted with the Vocabulary in Lyon's Travels, that the Arabs must have been lately driven out of this Country, or that they have lost their influence; else how are we to account for the Bornou language having so few Arabic words in it; for an explanation of this, see Review of Lyon's travels, in New Edinburgh Review, No. 2. page 366 and 367. It appears also, from the interesting narrative of the wreck of the French Brig, the *Sophia*, on the coast of the Sahara, recently published at Paris, that the Moors are not suffered to reside in Timbuctoo at this day, so that we may presume that the Negroes are gaining strength over the Muhamedans at Timbuctoo, as well as in the Empire of Bornou, although the proportion of Arabic words in the Vocabulary of the Timbuctoo language as noticed in the same page of the same Review, would hardly lead to this conclusion!

³ See the Map in Shabeeny's account of Timbuctoo, &c. page 55.

gradually assimilate with the surrounding inhabitants, and neither preserve their manners, customs, nor language unmixed.

P. 478. The bearing of the Kebly or Mekka is well known; an elucidation of this term is given in the *Classical Journal*, No. 44. page 356; voce Akably.

P. 481. Burkhardt informs us, that the Mugarbeen alphabet differs in several of its letters from the Oriental, which he tells us he knows from his own experience, and thinks it worth mentioning; many learned writers have recently told us the same, but not one of them, that I know of, has attempted to inform us, wherein this difference consists, which I shall now therefore endeavour to show. The difference is not in several letters, but in a very few; the Kaf ق, which in Asia has two points above it, has only one in Africa; the Oriental Fa ف has one point over it, but in Africa this point is under it thus ب; the Dal د of Africa is formed like the Oriental Dal, and also thus >, and the Dthal thus >; the point over the Oriental ظ is placed thus ط in Africa; there is no other difference; but the order of the alphabet differs from that of the Orientals, and is thus, beginning at the right hand.—

ا ب ت ث ج ح خ د ذ ر ز ط or ك ل م ن ص
ض ع غ ف ي س ش ة و ي * لا *

The order of the Oriental alphabet may be seen in any Arabic Grammar, and is too well known throughout Europe to need repetition.

P. 482. "The King of Kordofan *who is called Mosellim*, was formerly a slave of the King of Darfour."—Note, *Mosellim* is not the name of the King of Kordofan, neither is it a proper name, but the Arabic word that designates a Muhamedan, and is applied to all Pagans who are converted to Muhamedanism; this name was unquestionably applied to the King of Kordofan, to signify that he had been converted to that faith.

Appendix No. 2. p. 484.

P. 485. "Gondjava being a town of Darfour, where the learned men reside and have their schools, in the vicinity of Kobbe. It is the same place I believe, (says Mr. Burkhardt) which Mr. Brown calls Hellet el Fokara." There can be no doubt of this, although Hellet el Fokara signi-

fies the people or inhabitants, not the town; Hellet el Fokara, however, does not signify learned men, but priests or holy men, the term, learned men, is designated by the words Hellet el Ulemma.

485, 486. "This dye is produced from an indigenous plant, resembling Indigo, and which is said to be preferable to the Indigo of Egypt; both are known by the same name of Nili."—Note, the Indigo of Egypt, and that of Sudan are

both called Neel, نيل [not Nili,] and it is the true Indigo plant; the Indigo of Sudan is as much superior to that of Egypt, as the Guatamala Indigo is superior to that of the East Indies; a specimen of the color of this Indigo may be seen in the British Museum, in a piece of cotton cloth, manufactured at Timbuctoo, of a chequered pattern blue and white, intermixed with red silk; this curious manufacture was presented by me, to that national repository in 1796; the blue squares are dyed with Indigo of Sudan, and the scarlet with Cochineal; but whether they propagate the Cochineal in Sudan or not, I am unable to say, but I know that the cochineal tree abounds in lower Suse, particularly on the borders of Sahara; a circumstance well deserving the attention of Great Britain.

487. "أبو دوم Abu Doom" signifies the well *abounding in the fanpalm tree*, for دوم Doom is the fanpalm and نخل N'khul is the date tree, بئر حجرة Bir Hadjara (which I should write beer Hajra) signify the well of stones, or where stones abound. As these terms are given in Arabic without any explanation, this exposition of their signification may possibly be serviceable to some future traveller in Africa; as so many go there without a knowledge of the Arabic language, this circumstance alone renders the interpretation of consequence.

488. "بئر الخبيش Byr Akheybesh" signifies the well of sheep, but the word is not written with the guttural k [خ] but with the pure k, thus بئر الكبش

I am aware, how uninteresting these observations may appear to the general reader, but their importance to African travellers, I presume, cannot admit of a doubt, as they relate to words in common use and frequently occurring in our intercourse with Northern Africa.

"حلة المرابطين Heleit el morabtein" signifies the popu-

lation of *Holy men*, not learned men, the population of learned men would be *Hèllèt el Ulemma*.—A village, in Arabic, is called *Deshera*. I cannot agree with the editors of *Burkhardt's Travels* in calling *Helcit* a village, for *حلة* *Heleit* signifies a clan, a people, a population: as *Hellet Mass'r*, the people of Egypt, *Hellet Sudan*, the people of Sudan.

I have affirmed in the *Classical Journal*, No. 46, page 279, that the Arabic language is spoken or understood from the shores of Africa, in the Atlantic ocean, to the shores of the Red Sea, as well as throughout all countries of Northern Africa where any intercourse or commerce is maintained, and it is reasonable to suppose that this intercourse is in proportion to the *quota* of Arabic words introduced into the several languages of Sudan.¹—We are indebted to Mr. Burkhardt for the vocabularies of two languages of Sudan, viz. that of *Borgo*, (*Wadey* or *Dar Saleh*,) in which we find 138 words, of which twenty-four, or nearly one-sixth, are Arabic.—In the vocabulary of the *Bornou* language, is the same number of words, of which only nine, or one fifteenth, are Arabic;² and, I conclude, from this circumstance, that there is more intercourse and commerce with the Moors or trading people of Africa, among the *Borgo* people, than among those of *Bornou*.

Appendix No. 3. page 493.

P. 494. "The *Dokhen*, *Djawars*," one of these, and I think it is the *Dokhen* that is a small black seed, which the Arabs mix with bread; it is a febrifuge. The *Lubia* is the french bean, not the kidney bean, as Mr. Burkhardt supposes. The kidney bean is called *الفول* *Elfûle*.

P. 496. "They make the ceilings of their sitting rooms of the wood of the *Sant*," this is probably the *عرار* *Arar* which is a heavy, close and incorruptible wood, used for the interior of houses, resembling the cedar in smell. When I opened the port of *Santa Cruz* to European commerce, having occasion to pull down some of the rooms of my house, I found the beams perfectly sound and free from the worm, although they had been up fifty years; some of these *Arar* beams were ten inches square, and twenty feet long.

¹ See an Elucidation of this Hypothesis in the *Review of Lyon's Travels*, in the *New Edinburgh Review*, No. 2. page 367.

² A different report on this subject is given in the *Review of Lyon's Travels* in *New Edinburgh Review* No. 2. page 367.

P. 498. "The Green Nile carries down the wood Sant, the Bekum, and Kena." The Bekum is not the logwood as Burkhardt imagined, but the *Brazil wood*; it is an article in great estimation in Africa for dying red, it is imported into West Barbary from Lisbon, and it is called البقم El B'kum, but the logwood is called Awed el Khâl.

502. "To the South of them are forests and deserts inhabited by wild creatures like demons approaching to the figure of man, whom a horseman cannot overtake." Note, the inhabitants of the Desert of Barka have been reported to me to be a diminutive, wild, and savage race, more swift than a horse, but the swift-footed race here alluded to appear to border on Abyssinia.

508. "Representations were made to the Emir of the true believers, Djafar el Motewakel Al' Allah, upon which the latter ordered Muhamed el Komy to attack them:" query, which is the latter, for by this phraseology there appears to be two, but this is incorrect, for there is but one, and that is the Emir Djafar: El Motewakel Al'Allah is only a character assumed by the Emir, and signifies that he rests on the support of God only. This is a common addition to signatures among Muselmén, and is not unlike the mottos attached to the arms of our nobility, with this exception, viz., that these mottos or sentences affixed to the name or signature of the writer, invariably relate to God or to the trust the writer places in Allah.

512. "Omar Ibn Sharhabyt wrote this, in the month of Ramadan, in the year 31." The Annotator here tells us that there is a chasm in all the manuscripts, but this appears to be a mistake, for there is not any chasm whatever. When Europeans write, do they not date their writings simply with the day, month, and year? thus, 1st Jan. or Feb. 1822. We do not write Jan., ANNO DOMINI 1822, neither do the Muhamedans write in their ordinary documents, year OF THE HEJRA 1222, but simply the year 1222, thus, ١٢٢٢ع.

519. "In the month of Muharam of the year 815, the Arabs, Howara proceeded to Assouan and attacked the Beni Kenz, and obliged them to fly." It is correctly asserted in the note, that the Howara have their origin from a Mugarbeen tribe. I have travelled over all their country, which is a very fine and productive district, situated between Santa Cruz and Terodant, about 30 miles from E. to W. and about 20 from N. to S., between that branch of the

Atlas mountains, which runs E. and W. from the confines of Draha to Cape de Geer, and the river Suse, for which see the map, page 55 in Shabeeny's account of Timbuctoo, &c., Lat. N. 29° 40'. Longit. W. 9°. They are celebrated for warlike achievements and excel in horsemanship, they have a superior breed of horses and speak a purer dialect of the Arabic, than is generally spoken in the empire of Marocco. The personal charms of their women are proverbial as well as the elegance of their persons; they are rich in flocks, and lead a patriarchal life, they hold it dishonorable to intermarry with their neighbours, who are Shelluhs, they are honorable towards each other, which quality they express by the term *tēmārā*, but treacherous to strangers, and proud of the purity of their race.

Notes to the Appendixes to Burkhardt's Travels in Nubia.

(1) I doubt if the Mokel is not نخل the Nokul, the latter being the Arabic name for the date-tree which produces fruit, as Doum is the name for the unproductive date-tree, the fan-palm and other varieties.

(15) The Annotator says the Arabic reads

ولقد رايت علي بعضها علامة عربية “
 and another copy has علامة غربية which would mean, *I have seen myself on several of them very curious signs of workmanship.* But this, if it can be called a translation, is certainly a very latitudinal one, for there is no authority for very curious signs of workmanship: the words are “*Wa 'lkud rait ala badha alamat Arbiat,*” which literally means, *and also I saw on some (of them) Arabic signs or characters*, if the two latter words علامة غربية, alamat garbiat, be chosen, it would make the meaning, *signs or characters of the West*, but are we authorised to suppose that timber flowing down the Nile should have come from the West (or Western Africa?)

(22) “The Bekum is a dye wood, that comes to Cairo by the way of the Red Sea from India. I believe it to be the Logwood.” This is evidently an error. The Bekum المقم is an article of trade, it is the Brazil wood as before observed, which is shipped from Lisbon, (after being there landed from Brazil) for the ports of Western Africa, from whence it is carried across the desert to Sudan for its fine red dye. Egypt indeed, may receive it from the East Indies

(from Goa), from whence there is a constant trade with Brazil.

(23) The Kena قنّاء may be the wood of which the shafts of lances are made, but I apprehend it is also the wood of the Peruvian bark tree, as this name designates it to be.

(48) "I do not know what is meant by the *Habesh fowl*. In Egypt a species of fowl is distinguished by the name of Bedja fowl," but حجاجه البحر is *djaja elbhar*, which literally signifies any sea-bird or fowl.

(53) The *first* Arabic sentence in this note is

في عدة قوية ورجال منتخبة

which *truly* signifies "in a strong set of selected men," but the *latter* sentence is properly translated.

(56) The Arabic work here spoken of, as consisting of 20 or 30 volumes, is called اخبار الزمان Akbar Azzman, i. e. Intelligence concerning the past, or more properly of ancient or remote times.

Note, page 533. The land was assessed, not by the Feddan or Acre; this is incorrect, for feddan does not imply or designate an acre or any other *given* measure or quantity of space, but it signifies a field, and may consist of one or more acres as a field doth.

(82) The word garnata, in page 536, means Grenada.

Page 537. The river called Bah'r el Ahmar or the Red River is, I apprehend, another name for the *Sakkia el Ahmara* or the Red Stream, it is also called El Bahar Sahara or as Adams calls it Mar Zarah; this stream was considered by the last Emperor of Marocco to be the Southern confines of his dominions. The said Emperor Yezzed used to call it his Red River, *Wadi Ahmar*, as well as *Sakkia el Ahmara*.

Page 537. It is rather extraordinary, that Burkhardt, who was a man of liberal principles, should so far attach himself to the errors of his European predecessors, as to call Fas, Faz, when the celebrated Mugarbeen author, whose works he so favorably quotes, *Muhammed ben Abdallah El Waty*, commonly called Ben Batouta, invariably calls it in his celebrated work, Fas, فاس. In all the abridgments of this work that I have seen, it is also written Fas; some light may be had on this subject by referring to the abridgment

of this work at the University of Cambridge, and also by referring to the copy of this work at the University of Halle, which was presented to that University, I think, by Dr. Seitzen, who sent a copy to Vienna: whether either of these be the original work or only an abridgment like that at Cambridge, I am not competent to declare. The pronunciation of the word by the Arabs and Moors, who like the ancient Greeks and the Spaniards, always accommodate their orthography to their pronunciation, and do not encumber their words like the French and English with useless letters, is a further confirmation of this opinion.

(84) قرش Kirsh: the strength of the tail of this fish, I have been told, is such, that a blow from it will break a man's leg; it is a great enemy to the fishermen, whose nets they break by continually beating with their tail when caught; it is the fish commonly called with us the Dog-fish. I never saw any on the Western coast of Africa above 4 feet long.

Page 299. Our author informs us that the herb Sembil is imported at Shendy from Egypt, and is used as a perfume; the name of this plant in Arabic, as Burkhardt observes, is سنبل Sinnabel, but why it should be called Sembil I cannot tell; surely Mr. Burkhardt never wrote it so himself.

The Sinnabel is imported into all the Barbary States from Leghorn, Marseilles, and also from Amsterdam; it grows in Hungary and in the Southern States of the Austrian dominions; it is generally used as an infusion in the baths or as a perfume for the ladies when they bathe; it is called in the lingua franca of the Mediterranean, Spico Romano; it is packed in small parcels of about half a pound each, in casks twice the size of a large sugar hogshead; it is the Spiega Celtica of the Italians, or the Valeriana Celtica of the Romans.

In Baron de Humboldt's illustration of the Genus Circhona, there is, page 181, a representation of this plant, called by the author Valeriana Jatamansi.

P. 380. "Make haste, the caravan is in fear, if we remain here we shall be attacked, fill your water-skins and load your camels, for we shall depart immediately." These words are given as a translation of the following Arabic sentences, and a tolerably latitudinal one it is, for there is certainly no authority in the original Arabic for "Caravan is in fear," for "be attacked," nor for "we shall depart immediately."

استعجلوا يا ناس الجلابه ساقط اذا قعدنا يقتلون يا الله
 دلوا قربكم و شدوا على جم ————— الك ————— م

“Astajelu iä nes, eljilabah sakt, ida gädna ikuteluna, yallah, delu garebkume, wa shedu ala jemmelkume.”

But the following is more correct and literal:

“Make haste, O men! [or, separate, O men!] silence be with the camel-drivers, if we halt or sit down they will kill us, come, fill your skins (with water), and fasten them on your camels.”

P. 447. The note in this page insinuates, that unnatural propensities have not yet entered Africa, but this is so far from being the case, nay, it is so directly contrary to truth, that all Muhamedan Africa is polluted with this detestable propensity, and although it is reprobated in the Koran, yet the vice is so common, that it is connived at, being universally practised, and these unnatural propensities will prevail, so long as Muselmism shall prevail in the world, for reasons which decency forbids to be mentioned.

J. G. JACKSON.

LATIN EPISTLE TO THE LATE PROFESSOR PORSON.

THE following curiosity, for such we consider it, has been put into our hands by an old and valued friend, who thinks it deserving to be recorded in the Classical Journal. Our correspondent informs us, that Mr. Porson paid no attention to the letter, as coming from a writer unknown; but he certainly thought it worthy of preservation, or he would not have consigned it to the excellent person by whose kindness our correspondent is enabled to give this curious rescript to our readers.

HANC Epistolam, vir summe, mittit adolescens tibi prorsus ignotus: qui te enixe rogat ut se patienter audias.

Et primum veniam poscit quod dissimulato nomine te alloqui sustinuerit. Utinam liceret me meaque omnia tibi committere! Tu benignius audires, ego fervidiores liberioresque gratias agerem. Sed vetat imperiosa necessitas. Hoc fateri datur; nos inter juventutem academicam non primum certe dignitatis locum, at neque adeo infimum, tenere.

Quum igitur certa legendi ratione hactenus caruerim, et nunc in tragicos, nunc in Aristophanem, nunc in Demosthenem involaverim; vanum fuisse hunc laborem, opusque denuo redintegrandum esse video. Quod ne frustra fiat, decrevi hujus Epistolæ periculum facere; ut, tuis tandem monitis adjutus, ad interiorem Græcarum literarum scientiam aditus mihi patefacerem.

Et quamquam scio viros primarios non valde delectari tirunculos docendo; pene confido fore ut te votis meis, aliqua saltem ex parte, facilem præbeas; si modo reputaveris, quantulo negotio quantum beneficium dare possis. Eloquar igitur.

I. Quoniam plurimum pollet junctura et series, multum adjumenti dederis, indicando quo ordine legendi sint præcipui Scriptores Græci, nominatim Homerus, Scenici, Pindarus, tres Historici, Demosthenes, Plato, similesque.

Huc referre liceat utrum præstiterit auctores singulos ordine legere; an alternos, et quantis intervallis.

II. Hæreo de ratione quæ in legendo tenenda est. Ruhnkeniana, a Wyttenbachio V. Ruhnck. p. 54. memorata, sane regia est, et Hercule Musagete digna: sed forsitan juvenibus non minus accommodata est ea, qua usum esse maximum Newtonum audio; nempe ut Scriptorem primum levius percurreret, deinde attentius legeret, loca salebrosa ubique complanans. Tu dijudica.

III. Jam de Grammaticis quæro. Si, ut Piersono videtur, cæcutiendum est, nisi horum ope instructi simus; maximi erit cognoscere a quibusnam initium sit faciendum; quæ sit singulorum auctoritas.

IV. Pergratum mihi feceris, si selecta quædam priorum criticorum opera recensueris, eo ordine quo legenda sunt.

V. Lennepianam Analogiam ignorare quis velit cui innotuerunt heroës Batavi? Illud nescio, an a tironibus tractari vel possit vel debeat.

VI. Exercitationem in scribendo Græco a multis magistris sedulo inculcari video. Sed conturbat me Scaligeri

auctoritas, qui sic, de Vieta opinor, loquitur. "Iste homo optime Græce scribit, Græcas literas ignorat," quod de nonnullis ἀνδράσι μετῴρωφοναξι prædicari posse suspicor. Paucissimi certe reperiuntur qui Solæcismos crebros effugiant. Dubito igitur, annon tempus, utiliter sane collocatum in scribendo, utilius collocaretur in legendo. Idem quæro de versionum genere Anglice dicto "double translations;" quod tantopere laudant Gibbonus, Plinius, Aschamus, Rollinus, et, puto, Lockius.

Hæc tibi, vir summe, quanta potui brevitate, exposui; missis laudum blanditiarumque vanis ambagibus: quibus, ut minime eges, ita minime te gaudere credo. Sin autem majora, quam pro adolescentulo ignoto a te petiisse videar, scias velim, me maximo gaudio exultaturum, si me vel una lineola, uno verbo beare dignatus fueris. Utinam liceret ima præcordia tibi pandere, ut videres quantos Græcarum Literarum amores, quantam tui reverentiam conceperim! Vale.

Si nos responsione dignaveris, scribe
X. Y.

Mr. G. Bridgman's,
2, Copthall Court.

Mr. Porson,
Rev. Dr. Raine's,
Charter House.

FRANCISCUS PORTUS AND HIS ÆSCHYLUS.

A QUESTION has lately been discussed by Dr. Blomfield and myself, respecting the rightful owner to certain MS. emendations, found on the margin of various copies of Stephens' Æschylus, preserved in public and private libraries in England, and on the continent, and marked with the initials F. P. or singly P.

Dr. Blomfield has thus expressed his opinion on the subject.
"I cannot easily believe, that the conjectures marked P. were

really those of Portus, whether Franciscus, the Cretan, or Ænilius, but rather of Casaubon."

Had Dr. Blomfield looked into Muretus' notes on Catullus, p. 63. fol. vers. Ald.—p. 69. ed. 1582., he would have found ample reason for doubting the validity of his creed. At least Franciscus, the Cretan, is there described, as "*homo et Latinarum et Græcarum literarum cognitione excellens, qui tum in aliis optimis utriusque linguae scriptoribus, tum in Æschylo multa felicissime emendavit, quæ adhuc in omnibus impressis libris depravata circumferuntur.*"

This testimony, *omni exceptione majus*, confirms the tradition, handed down in the Bodleian copy, described by myself in the preface to the notes on the Supplices, p. 51., and on the Eumenides, p. 37., where it is thus written: "*Æschylus partim ex Porto partim ex Aurato restitutus.*"

Thus much for ascribing the notes of an unknown scholar to the rightful owner; as to the accuracy in stating a fact, I beg leave to say, 1. that the copy of Stephens' Æschylus, from the margin of which he has transcribed the emendations of Portus, Auratus, and Casaubon, never belonged to Musgrave; and 2. that the book, which did belong to Musgrave, was a copy of the Glasgow Æschylus.

Had Dr. Blomfield but glanced at the preface to my Supplices, p. 52., he might have avoided this mistake. The last observation which I have to make on this sentence is, that as Casaubon's name is mentioned but twice in Mr. Mitford's book, as quoted by Dr. Blomfield himself, the reason for attributing to Casaubon the other conjectures, not marked at all, or marked with P. or F. P., seems to rest on a weak foundation.

But in truth, the whole of this *rixa* is *de lana caprina*, as the testimony of Muretus, in favor of the Cretan, puts the matter to rest.

G. BURGESS.

NOTICE OF

MUNUSCULUM JUVENTUTI, seu Phædri Fabulæ versibus Hexametris concinnatæ: necnon Specimina quædam solutæ orationis, non tam ad sensum earundem fabularum aperiendum, quam ad regulas linguæ Latine illustrandas, accommodata. Auctore DANIEL FRENCH. 1821. Priestley. 8s.

OUR readers will probably recollect, that in a recent number we noticed and recommended to their especial favor, a “specimen of a translation of the adventures of Telemachus,” by Mr. French. Whether this gentleman’s happy attempt to transfer the chaste beauties of Fenelon into the language of antiquity, have not met with the patronage we ventured to say it deserved, or whether the present publication be only a relaxation from his more important task; one of those short excursions, as it were, from the main path of his occupations, in which literary men delight to indulge; certain it is we cannot but lament that the completion of his project is for any reason deferred. It is not that Mr French has not shown the same copiousness, ease, and felicity of Latin style in this little work as in the former, but we cannot help thinking that the latter comes in a more questionable shape, with respect to general utility and adoption, than the former. The translation of Telemachus must have been acceptable to many; the *Munusculum*, though a most elegant volume, seems rather to have been written to display the talents and gratify the taste of the *author*, than to confer a lasting benefit on the learned of the age, or those about to become so. The *Munusculum* is still a *specimen*, and the ‘rising youth’ do not now-a-days receive compositions either in Latin prose or verse as particularly acceptable *gifts*, though they are compelled to pay them due attention when put into their hands as school-books. When this is said, all is said. No one can deny the accomplishments which Mr. French here displays, but many will probably be found who will ask, why he does not turn them to some work of unquestionable utility. Part of this work it is true, indeed more divisions of it than one, if taken separately, might be made a valuable initiatory manual for young students; other parts are adapted to the tastes of a far higher class: and in the case of school-books, it ought to be recollected that they should contain nothing more than is strictly necessary, and that

they are generally and very properly published in a less ambitious form than the very handsome book now before us. Before these observations, however, perhaps it would have been only just to state the nature of the contents of Mr. French's new publication. The fables of Phædrus, turned into hexameter verse, form the nucleus. Appended to each of these fables, in place of the old moral, is an application, illustration, or parallel case in the shape of a theme. These are written in a beautiful flowing Ciceronian style, abound in a variety of pleasant subjects treated in an agreeable and sometimes eloquent manner, and afford the best models we have seen for the theses, in which young Latin scholars first practise composition and call into exercise the stores of their reading. Prefixed to all this, by way of preface, is a very felicitous translation of a paper of the *Spectator* on fables. The fables themselves are followed by a great number of distinct Latin sentences, partly as examples of expression, modulation, and construction, and partly for the sake of the sentiment they convey. All these are excellent in their way, and were they printed alone, and in a separate and smaller form, a choicer book to be put into the hands of beginners cannot be found: for the remark each of these sentences contains is in general acute, sensible, and striking, often noble, well-suited to catch the admiration of a generous boy, and yet not at all above the comprehension of a common youth. The harmony and *flow* too is so remarkable, that a repeated iteration of them could not fail to form the scholar's ear to the measured music of Ciceronian prose. Again, the rear of these sentences is closed by a Latin version of a paper from the *Rambler*, and three of Addison's on tragedy. An address to the reader comes after these, with which the curtain is dropped over the various contents of the volume. We will however give a specimen or two of the more important parts, which we doubt not will as well bear us out in our praises, as justify the censures we have been reluctantly compelled to pass. Take the following as a specimen of the fables, and of the applications appended to each:—

VULPES ET AQUILA.—NE MAGNUS TENUEM DESPICITO.

Quamvis sublimes humilem non temnere debent,
Quod vindicta patet quibus est solertia mentis.

Vulpinos catulos Aquila olim sustulit alte
Nidoque imposuit pullis immitibus escam.
Aspectu mater lacrymans clamore fatigat
Ne tantum sibi mœrorem importaret acerbum.
Tuta loco, miserandam illa aspernatur ab alto.
Ardentem Vulpes torrem raptavit ab ara,
Sedemque ingenti circumdedit arboris igni,

Pro raptis natis hostem sic ulta ferocem.
Deinde suis Aquila ut lethum depelleret instans,
Suppliciter vulpi natos festina remisit.

Homines malefico animo et ad injuriam faciendam parati, utcumque in omne nefas linguarum licentia raptantur, non tamen temere aut inconsulte omnes lædunt; sed ecs tantum in quibus maxime elucet mansuetudo morum ac facilitas, quibus nihil ferocitatis, nihil nervorum ad resistendum inesse existimant. Accidit igitur nonnunquam, ut effrænatum hoc hominum genus (loquor autem de lingua potius quam manu rapacibus) homunculi cujusdam inopinato frangat et comminuat astutia. Sic, me audiente, paucis abhinc annis, Jurisconsultus apud forum nostrum percelebris, humilem quemdam et ignotum omnibus probris con-scindebat, rapiebatque, violentissimo impetu, qua nihil ei in terra antiquius, scilicet bonam ejus existimationem. Ille vero diu injusteque omnibus contumeliis vexatus, memor credo veteratoris istius Ulyssis, ita astute agebat, ut fituum quemdam esse aut saltem infantissimum jurares. At vero, ubi conticuit jurisconsulti istius importuna lingua, quæ nunquam non auro facile movebatur ad lædendum optimum quemque, aurum vero eloquentiæ flumen ex ore suo profunderè nunquam didicerat; surrexitque tandem ad respondendum homunculus ille, modesto vultu, humili voce, verbisque etiam humilioribus initio utens, donec ad altissimum eloquentiæ gradum sensim pedetentimque ascendit; Dū boni! quam misere fœdeque lacerata est ista injuriosa aquila! quam demisso tractoque animo apparuit! quantus in ore pallor! in labiis tremor! in facie vultuque quanta significatio inerat casti, casti animi! Quam trepide tandem, postquam ille alter finem loquendi fecerat, confessurus surrexit, se fuisse in errorem inductum, hominemque adeo integerrimum læsisse!

The following extract from the paper on fables (*Spectator*, No. 512), also shows Mr. French's command of an elegant and forcible narrative style. We request our readers to compare the translations with the original:—

Narrant imperatorem Mahmoud, continentibus suis bellis, quæ in regionibus alienis gereret, sævaque illa tyrannide quam in cives suos exerceret, non solum exinanisse regnum, verum etiam populum Persarum multis in locis pœne ad interitum redegisse. Hujus Regis negotiorum omnium curator, id est, Præfectus, (sive homo natura facetiarum amans, sive æstu quodam mentis abreptus fuerit, parum comperi,) simulavit, se a sapiente quodam viro rationem intelligendi linguas avium didicisse, eamque ita callere, nulla ut esset ubique axis, quæ os aperire posset, quin statim, quid diceret, ei intellectum foret. Cum reverteretur quodam die vespere, una cum imperatore, a venando, conspicati sunt duos bubones super arborem quæ propter vetustissimum murum ex aggere ruinarum crescebat. Vellem equidem scire, inquit imperator, quid inter se colloquantur isti duo bubones! admove aurem sermoni eorum, mihi que rationem redde. Igitur accedit ad arborem Præfectus, colloquutionesque eorum attentissimis auribus excipere videtur. Tum ad imperatorem reversus, Audi, inquit, mi imperator, partem eorum sermonis, at quid inter se dixerint, id enunciare non ausim. Imperator vero hoc tali responso minime contentus, coëgit eum omnia quæcunque essent locuti sigillatim exponere. Scias igitur, inquit Præfectus, alteri horum bubonum esse filium, alteri filiam; deque pacto nunc agi, quod eos ve-

lint matrimonio conjungere. Filii pater, me audiente, ita est apud patrem filiae locutus: Jungatur quidem hoc matrimonium, per me licet; tantum paciscaris velim, te vicos quinquaginta prostratos et dirutos pro dote filiae tuæ daturum. Cui filiae pater, Imo vero, inquit, non solum quinquaginta, verum etiam quingentos, si ita tuus fert animus, libenter dederò. Quare multos annos imperatori nostro concedant Dii; eo enim vivo, nunquam nobis defutura est dirutorum vicorum copia.

Imperatorem dicunt ita hac fabula fuisse perniotum, ut oppida atque vicos omnes deletos rursus ædificandos curaverit, omnemque suam reliquam ætatem incommodis populi sui sarcien-dis consumpserit.

We now turn to the end of the book, and really feel at a loss what to select, where all is so excellent. Our limits forbid us to take more than two passages, the first from the Rambler, (Ex homine errabundo) No. 202, for the style, and the other from the Spectator, No. 39, for the difficulty of the subject, and the mode in which it is conquered.

Johnson is reflecting on the abuse of the word *poverty* by poets and others—

Perpauca sunt verba quorum vis maximæ parti hominum videtur magis esse perspecta, quam *Paupertas*. Quicumque tamen Poetas evolverit, conditionem vitæ isto verbo designatam prorsus suo rerum usui observationique repugnantem inveniet. Tantum abest quidem ut sordidum illud, miserandum, querulum, molestum, atque aliorum voluntati obnoxium possit agnoscere (quæ omnia de paupertate cogitans opinione præcipere consuevit) ut nihil aliud obversetur oculis, nisi animi tranquillitas, innocentia, frons hilaris atque læta, sanitasque corporis; securitas denique atque otium pacatissimum libertate conjuncta. Reperiet ibi voluptates nemini nisi qui nullis possessionibus impediatur cognitæ; facilemque somnum in humilitatem tantummodo casæ dulcia sua profundentem dona. Tanta sunt quidem quæ repudiandis divitiis comparanda sint blandimenta vitæ, ut reges ipsos ad deponenda regna, imperatoresque ad triumphorum decus aspernandum allicere valeant, quo possint in hoc paupertatis Elysio recumbentes, procul ab omni curarum strepitu, mollissimo consopiri otio.

Igitur si hoc scriptorum genus satis audias, nihil stultius fieri potest, quam perpetua illa de divitiis contentio; quibus pax orbis terrarum agitur, omnisque fere animus insidijs atque æmulandi studio accenditur! neque ullæ sunt magis reprehendendæ hominum querelæ, quam quas bonorum fortunæ desiderium fundat; istorum scilicet bonorum, quæ, ut philosophi maxima celebritate docent, nihil sunt aliud nisi compedes auratæ, vim eam habentes, ut possessorem simul obruant exornentque! dulcia quædam venena, jucunda illa quidem ad breve tempus palato, mox vero languore, doloribusque exquisitissimis, quantum in se habeant maligni demonstrantia.

Enimvero, proprium est paupertatis, nullius concitata invidia, ætatem degere felicem, sanitateque sine ope medicinarum perfrui; in securitate atque otio sine præsidio agere; idque demum largiente natura sibi comparare, quod amplissimis fortune divitiisque affluentibus homines, non sine adjumento fabricarum, comitumque, adulatorum et speculatorum, plerumque obtinent.

Attamen, re propius explorata, cuivis perspicuum erit, auctores qui

laudationem paupertatis conscripserint, longe alia de re loqui, ac eos qui ejus lugeant miseras. Poetis quidem usu venit, ut mentibus eorum semper grande quoddam et magnificum sese ostendat; cumque soliti sint regnorum occasus animo contemplari, proque regibus in miseras projectis flebilis quædam composito fundere; omnes nimirum in paupertatis gradu collocant, qui non ad cultum regum accedere videantur. Non imperitare gentibus, non classes neque exercitus alere, id quidem est, pauperem esse vocibus poetarum.

Et sane, hujusce scribendi vitii, aliqua ex parte causa est quædam sui ostentatio. Qui nullo negotio philosophus cupit evadere, facile quidem ambitioni suæ blanditur, complectendo scilicet paupertatem quam sensurus non est; sibi que magnopere tribuendo ob divitiarum contemptiorem, ubi ei jam plus adest, quam quibus uti queat.

Quicumque id agit, ut amplioris cujusdam animi signa ostendat, persuadeatque aliis quam alta spectet, quantoque in splendore et magnificentia versari soleat; loquatur sane vir talis, exemplo Cowleii, de humili conditione vitæ, deque otio suo obscurissimo; de paucitate earum rerum, ad vivendum necessarium, ac molestiis omnis supellectilis supervacuæ; ut tum demum sicut ille quingentis nummis aureis singulis annis se fore contentum gloriatur! Non quod fortuna talis pro impensis a superbia luxurieque exigendis sit perampla, sed certe ejusmodi est, cui minime conveniat philosopho nomen paupertatis imponere. Nemo enim pauper vocari potest, qui non plerosque mortales se ipso locupletiores videat.

In the next extract Addison is speaking of the metres and style in English tragedy—

Aristoteles versus censet iambicos ex omnibus in Græca lingua maxime esse ad Tragædiarum confectionem accommodatos; his enim fieri, ut et altius soluta oratione consurgat, et propius quam ulli alii versus ab ea abesse videatur. Sæpissime enim inquit homines audire licet, in omni consuetudine sermonis, iambicos versus per imprudentiam dicentes. Neque enim non idem in versibus nostris solutionibus notandum est. Inscruntur enim sæpe fortuito in nostro quotidiano genere sermonis; cumque medium quiddam tenent solutam inter orationem et versus illos rythmo terminatos, mirifice quidem ad tragædiam eorum accommodatus est usus. Quocirca nihil magis mihi stomachum movet, quam videre tragædiam compedibus rythmorum vinctam numerosæ. Hoc enim æque absurdum est ac si quis tragædiam Latine versibus hexametris conficeret. Plus etiam peccatur, ut ego quidem arbitror, in scenis istis ubi alias rythmo alias versu solutiore utuntur, tanquam duabus inter se differentibus linguis; aut ubi similitudines quasdam videmus condecoratas rythmo, dum omnia circumcirca versibus jacent solutis. Nolim tamen poetis nostris usu omnino quorundam rythmorum interdicare, in extrema scilicet Tragædia, vel in extremo quoque actu, si ita eis collibitum est; qui similem habeant effectum cum vocularum quibusdam inflexionibus quæ in Italicis istis concentibus adhiberi solent post cantionem procerissimam, quæque actorem haud sine lepore ac dignitate ex scena dimittant. Videmus etiam nonnullis in locis apud antiquas illas Tragædias numerorum varietatem adhibitam; eo quidem consilio, ne unam semper eandemque modulationem vocis aures defatigatione fastidiant. Igitur orationes illæ in Tragædiis nostris quæ hemistichio aut dimidiato versu concluduntur, haud displicent, licet ille qui sermonem excipit, novum versum incipiat, priore non suppleto. Neque etiam versus istos

qui, medio fere cursu interrupte insistunt ad indulgendum alicui animi affectu qui exprimitur, repudiaverim.

We heartily wish we could adorn our pages with more from this part of the work, but we fear we have already occupied too much space; though not at all inclined to consider the claims and pretensions of so finished a Latin scholar as Mr. French, and one who is possessed of an art far too uncommon among the students of this country, of slight importance in the Republic of letters. In the conclusion, Mr. French states that it has been suggested to him, that a selection from the Rambler and Spectator, if translated into Latin, after the manner of these specimens, would be an acceptable volume to students who are laboring to attain a Latin style; and we agree with him, in thinking that the scholar might continually compare his own translation of the English with Mr. French's, as a model, with the greatest advantage and improvement. Should Mr. F. execute his project, we cordially wish, that the design may be as profitable to himself, as it will be we doubt not to his readers.

PROLOGUE

TO THE ANDRIA OF TERENCE,

PERFORMED AT WESTMINSTER SCHOOL, 1821.

Si quando Alumnis licuit, ut rebus super
 Pauca eloquantur (pace vestra) publicis,
 Sive indolendum, sive lætandum siet;
 Velim rogatos singulos vos, Hospites,
 Num gratulandi plenior sese locus
 Obtulerit unquam, juris aut nostri magis,
 Hac nocte votis quam favet tandem piis.

Nam locus, Alumni et dulce nomen Regii,
 Datumque nobis gaudii consortium,
 Velant silere sedibus nuper sacris
 Regem receptum atque Imperi fidem ratam?
 Testes (videndi fecit ipse copiam)
 Testes honoris fuimus—Ipsam inter duces
 Animo paterno, jure jam proprio, sua
 Gestare dextra sceptræ læti vidimus;
 Quum Summum ad aras voce testatus Deum
 Semper futurum se suis promitteret
 Custodem, Amicum, Vindicem, Patriæ Patrem!

Nec, dum favebat omnis assurgens chorus,
(Nos quo licebit gloriemur) ullius,
Quam nostro ab ore missa sincero, magis
Vox illa "Vivat" personabat atria!

Vos quid moramur plura? vos, partem quibus
Honoris esse contigit felicibus.

Te præter omnes unice spectabilem,
Frederice, quid moramur? Ipse proximus
Nam genere, dignitate, nam Regi simul
Amore visus—Ipsè, quæ deceat fides,
Exemplum et Auctor civibus mirantibus!

Quod reliquum, alumnos oro pro certo scias
Benignitate Regis usuros bene.

Inita auspicato, vita servabit modum,
(Fortuna quicquid jusserit,) constans sibi.

Quis non ab illo fausto et inclyto die
Alumnus omnen cepèrit? se Patriæ
Eo arbitratus ire consultum optume,
Quo dignitatem Regiam tuebitur.

EPILOGUE.

DAVUS—CRITO.

Dav.—O noster, salve! præter spem occurris, Athenis
Quid tu ultra?

Cri.—Rogitas? hospes in urbe moror—
Qui possem melius? quando hic sapientia, et artes,
Et queiscunque aliis rustica turba caret.
Sed tu opportune: facies ita versa locorum,
Dux quærendus erat.

Dav.—Nil magis hercle placet.

Cri.—Quam monstro simile est urbs hæc! et crescit in
horas—

Ah! ne mole precor sit ruitura sua!
Ut sperat mihi mos, illac transire parabam,
Quæsieram toties qua loca sueta puer.—
Nil quicquam agnovi—gypsata palatia supra,
Infra multiplici merce fenestra nitet—
Circus ibi—Quadrans—crescentis Cornua Lunæ,
Porticus et (credo) Stoica.

Dav.—Plena Sophis.

Cri.—Sed, quæso, ulla extant hodie spectacula rerum?—

Dav.—Omnigena—incertum est quænam adeunda prius—

Belzoni tumulus, Belzonius ipse, Bonassus—

Parva equa—cum catulis quinque læna suis—

Deinde Gigas—Nanus—Dux efferus Indus et uxor—

Vel tabulæ veteres—vel Panorama novum—

Quin ista egregii persona altique silenti,

Quæ ludit, nutat, cogitat, Automaton—

Cri.—Prodigiosa satis narras—hæc mitte—age tandem,

Dic mihi quo stet res scenica, Dave, loco.

Ah! quoties scamno in primo sessorve secundo

Ipse gravis Critici munere functus eram!

Nil ego contulerim scenis: ea sana voluptas,

Præcipit et vitæ blanda magistra modum.

Dum vates animos irritat, temperat, angit,

Aut satira culpas acrius insequitur,

Delectansque monensque simul—quam digna poëta

Officia—

Dav.—Ah! sanus, quæso, animi satin' es?

Aut homines aut multum hodie distare Poëtas

Arbitror: is nimium mos vetus artis habet—

Crede mihi—est via simplicior—percellere sensus,

Et captare oculos cura laborque vagos.

Divisum imperium Pictoribus atque Poëtis.

Tædeat actorum? picta tabella placet.

Fabula quippe nova inventa est, Melodrama vocatur:

Mille habet ornatus unica, mille modos.

Hinc terrent ignes, et sanguinolenta duella,

Italicis numeris inde Bravura sonat.

Siqua moræ fuerint, in promptu en Canticum! et

omnes

Solvuntur nodi—

Cri.—Fit novus iste Deus.

Dav.—Denique fit festum, atque agitur sub fine triumphus—

Causa latet—cur hoc pompa videnda minus?

Insonuere tubæ—prosceni aulæa levantur—

Et spatia usque patent interiora domus—

Gemmarum atque auri ficto splendore coruscans,

Compositis tardus gressibus, ore minax,

Omnis cantator, saltatorque omnis, et actor

Visus ibi innumeras ire redire vias—

Vexillum, belli exuviæ, conopea, currus,

Et, Cydno invehitur qua Cleopatra, ratis!

Tum vero trepidare animi, atque inhiare popellus;

Tum superos rapiunt gaudia vana Deos.

Fit turba in caveis—consurgitur undique, lævæ
Dextera concurrit—pilea missa volant—

Cri.—Ista putas lucri esse ?

Dav.—Fides si danda choragis ;

Ecce ut res nunc sunt, charta modesta satis !

“ Drama novum plausu immenso ac fervente receptum

“ Cœtus illustres innumerosque trahit—

“ Assidue quæsita sedilia—fabula in omnem

“ Protinus hebdomadam quaque iteranda vice est—

“ Prorsus veste nova, ornatu, scenisque—” .

—————*Cri.* Boni Di !

Cedit an his nugis Æschylus ipse locum ?

An penitus periit Sophoclis decus ?

—————*Dav.* Haud ita—at ipse,

Paucis mutatis, fit Melodramaticus.

Prodiit hæc specie post jam his mille ducentos

Quadraginta annos Œdipus, ut referunt.

Cri.—Ars metamorphosis quænam hæc siet ?

Dav.—Haud scio : factum

Est : Davus sum, non Œdipus—an placet hoc ?

Spectatumne ?

Cri.—Egon' ? at valeat res ludicra ; curent

Infantes, stulti, foemineumque genus.

Hæc jam sola suis digna inveniuntur Athenis,

Hæc referunt priscum sola theatra decus.

Ostenduntur ubi vera exemplaria vitæ,

Et mores reddit fabula cuique suos—

Usque seni, decies quanquam repetita, Venustas,

Usque placent, juveni qui placuere, Sales.

*On the true Age of Christ at the Crucifixion, and the
fulfilment of the Seventy Weeks in Daniel.*

AN inquiry into the true age of Christ when he was crucified, may perhaps be thought of little consequence by some ; but as we frequently hear sceptics say, that “ it was not possible for him to have promulgated his religion even over the small district of Judea in the short space of three years and a half,” it will be allowed by the learned and intelligent, that if we can find good reason to conclude that he lived to a more advanced time of life, no such objection can be made in future.

There are two sources from whence we may gather sufficient evidence, that the common opinion respecting the age of Christ at his crucifixion is erroneous; these are, the Scriptures and Profane History: I shall therefore take these as my guide. The Scripture is undoubtedly the living and incontrovertible evidence, respecting the circumstances which took place at the commencement of the Christian era, and must be conclusive on all the subjects contained in it, however the commandments of God have been made void by the traditions of men.

The almost universal opinion of Christians at this day is, that Christ was crucified when he was thirty-three years of age. Thus all commentators since the fourth century, and during the ascendancy of the power of the Pope, have so understood; for in those ages, on account of the terror of the inquisition, and the power of the sword, no one dared to write any thing in contradiction to the supposed infallibility of the Pope and the councils. But by attending to the proofs which may be brought in opposition to this long received opinion, we shall have reason to conclude that at the crucifixion Christ was more advanced in life.

Had Christian commentators considered that the life and doctrines of Christ, before his crucifixion, had been promulgated, not only throughout the land of Canaan, but also to many distant nations, it would also have occurred to them, that in the short space of three years, a single individual (who must have been some time before he could have collected together twelve intelligent men) could not have rendered himself, his life and doctrines, so famous as to shake the very foundation of the Jewish church, which had lasted 1500 years; the Christian religion could not have been so universally known, throughout Asia and Africa, as we find it was immediately after the crucifixion, had the Redeemer been only three years in the ministry. Some may think it strange, that things of so important and interesting a nature should have remained so long covered in darkness; but unless we can persuade ourselves that we have arrived at the *ne plus ultra* of all knowledge, there must be a time when other important things will be discovered. And it may then be said of such, as it was of Newton—What! has the world been in ignorance till this man arose? But as it is written that *knowledge shall increase, that the knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth, as the waters cover the sea*, I believe the unerring testimony of the sacred record, and that many will be influenced in the order of the divine providence, to aid the great design of God in the promulgation of divine knowledge.

In order to form a right conclusion concerning this matter,

I shall first consider the obvious application of the seventy weeks mentioned in the 9th chapter of the book of Daniel, at the expiration of which it is expressly said, *Messiah shall be cut off*: Verses 24th, 35th, 26th, *SEVENTY WEEKS are determined on thy people, and thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the Most Holy. Know therefore and understand, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to rebuild Jerusalem unto the Messiah the Prince, shall be SEVEN WEEKS, and THREESCORE AND TWO WEEKS: the street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times. And after THREESCORE AND TWO WEEKS shall Messiah be cut off.*

Christians and Jews are agreed that the seventy weeks signify four hundred and ninety years; that is, in the prophetic language of Scripture, a day for a year. But they say that the *four hundred and ninety years* mean the time from the destruction of the first, to the destruction of the second temple. It is, however, not true that there is an interval of four hundred and ninety years only, between the destruction of the first and second temples: the destruction of the first temple, or temple of Solomon, happened in the year of the Julian period 4124, before Christ 590 years; whereas the second temple was laid in ashes in the year of the Julian period 4783, A. D. 70: so that the whole interval between the destruction of the first temple and the second temple, amounts to no less than *six hundred and fifty-nine years*. So much for the Jewish account of the 490 years, which is a convincing argument of the ignorance of the Jews as to their own history. But it is evident that the text has no such meaning. Can we for a moment suppose that the commission of the angel, or messenger, was of no greater importance than to inform Daniel that it meant the pulling down of one temple and building another? The prophet says "*Seventy weeks are determined;*" to do what? TO BRING IN EVERLASTING RIGHTEOUSNESS. As this term of 490 years was determined on, TO BRING IN EVERLASTING RIGHTEOUSNESS, it must have been brought in at the end of that term: was it brought in, according to the understanding of the Jews, at the end of that period? No; then we must of necessity look for another definition of this prophecy. For though Jews, in opposition to Christians, say that the Messiah mentioned in the 25th verse is Cyrus, and that the Messiah mentioned in the 26th verse means King Agrippa, it is clear that the

Messiah spoken of in the 25th verse, is the same Messiah mentioned in the 26th verse; the connexion is not in the least broken, nor is there a second person mentioned before the latter part of the 26th verse, when the Roman Emperor is introduced, who is only called *prince*, and not MESSIAH or ANOINTED. Surely if the petty King Agrippa was worthy of the title *anointed*, because he was a king, the Emperor of Rome had as great a right to such an appellation. . But say they, “the king was the Lord’s anointed,” as David says, with regard to Saul, Sam. i. 26, 29; *for who can stretch forth his hand against the Lord’s anointed?* The kings of the Jews were not more the *anointed of the Lord* after the Babylonish captivity, than the idolatrous kings were the anointed of the Lord: neither can the Messiah of the 25th verse be applied to Cyrus; for though Isaiah in the 45th chap. v. 1. says, *Thus saith the Lord to his anointed, to Cyrus, whose right hand I have holden to subdue nations before him*, no inference can be drawn, that the word MESSIAH, either by itself or with such attributes as occur in this passage of Daniel, is ever applied in Scripture to any earthly prince. Vide Brev. Chron. p. 310. We are plainly told that Cyrus was *anointed to subdue nations and to loose the loins of kings*; but Daniel’s Messiah was to bring in EVERLASTING RIGHTEOUSNESS at the end of four hundred and ninety years. Nor can the Jews to this day make the Messiah of the 26th verse—*shall Messiah be cut off*—apply to King Agrippa, who is said to have been put to death by Vespasian, about four years before the destruction of the temple; for it is evident from the account given by their own historian, Josephus, that he lived many years after the destruction of Jerusalem. He says, l. xx. ch. 3, “By Claudius, Agrippa was put in possession of the kingdom of Chalcis, and by Nero of the cities of Tiberias, Tarichæa and Julias:” and Photius, in cod. 33. says, “His reign ended with his death, in the third year of Trajan.” As the 490 years will not reach from the destruction of the first to the destruction of the second temple—as everlasting righteousness was not brought in at the destruction of the second temple—as it is evident that Cyrus, the anointed in Isaiah, was not the Messiah of Daniel—and as Agrippa could not be the Messiah who was *cut off*; the application of the seventy weeks according to the Jews, falls entirely the ground.

Agreeably to the positive declaration of the prophecy, the advent of the Messiah was to take place four hundred and thirty-four years from that time when the commandment went

forth to restore and rebuild Jerusalem; *Know therefore and understand, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem, unto the Messiah the Prince, shall be sixty and two weeks.* Hence it is certain that the commencement of this division of the seventy weeks, must necessarily have been when a commandment went forth to restore and to build Jerusalem, and that MESSIAH THE PRINCE should appear at the conclusion of the sixty-two weeks, or four hundred and thirty-four years.

Now as Messiah was to make his appearance at the conclusion of four hundred and thirty-four years from the time that the *commandment went forth to restore and to build Jerusalem*; it follows, that the second division of the seventy weeks, *seven weeks*, or forty-nine years, was to commence when Messiah made his advent, at the expiration of the sixty-two weeks, or four hundred and thirty-four years. And it is as certain that his continuance was to be forty-nine years, when, agreeably to the 24th verse, he was to *finish transgression, and to make an end of sin, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and the prophecy, and to anoint the most holy.* So that the prophet not only plainly foretells the precise time when MESSIAH was to appear, but also the time when he was to be cut off.

It seems proper first to ascertain in which reign of the Persian kings the commandment went forth for the express purpose declared in the words of the prophecy, *to restore and build Jerusalem.* If this can be determined, we shall to a certainty know to whom this prophecy was applied by the prophet, and whether this great personage was capable of accomplishing all those glorious promises.

It appears that we have but four Persian kings mentioned in Scripture—Cyrus, Ahasuerus, Darius, and Artaxerxes, Ezra, ch. iv. 5, 6, 7. Nor was there a necessity to introduce more; because, in the reigns of these kings, the Hebrews were established in their own land. Although Cyrus gave them leave to return to Jerusalem, it is sufficiently evident from the book of Ezra, ch. iv. 24, that the enemies of the Hebrews induced the then reigning king of Persia to put a stop to the building of the temple. This king of Persia is called in the translation *Artaxerxes*, but this was not the Artaxerxes who published the decree for the full restoration of the people and the building of the wall; for Darius succeeded him, ch. vi. 1.

Neither does it appear that under the reign of Darius any de-

cree was issued to restore and rebuild the city and the wall ; for we find it recorded, that permission was given only to build the temple, Ezra, ch. vi. 13, which was finished in the 6th year of that king.

But it does appear that in the reign of the fourth king of Persia, a decree was granted by the king, to *restore and rebuild Jerusalem and the wall thereof*, which had not been granted in any of the former reigns. For it is said, *Jerusalem lieth waste, and the gates thereof are burnt with fire ; come let us build up the wall of Jerusalem*, Neh. ch. ii. 17. And it also appears that this decree was of such consequence as to be carried into effect by the military power of Persia, Ch. ii. 9. Now the Ptolemean catalogue—Herodotus, Thucydides, Ctesias, Justin, Diodorus, Berosus, and others, are of weighty authority. The following, drawn from thence in proof of the chronology of the Scripture, gives us a particular statement of the succession and chronology of these four kings of Persia, prior to the commencement of the SIXTY-TWO WEEKS, or *four hundred and thirty-four years*, which, together with the SEVEN WEEKS, or *forty-nine years*, make *four hundred and eighty-three years* ; at the expiration of which, in the midst of the SEVENTIETH WEEK, or *three years and a half*, it is expressly said, *Messiah shall be cut off*.

Now Cyrus reigned twenty-eight full years, Ahasuerus seven, Darius thirty-six, and Artaxerxes thirty-one full years, Neh xiii. 6. Cyrus was succeeded in the government of Persia by Ahasuerus, *who reigned from India even unto Ethiopia, over a hundred and twenty-seven provinces*.

Darius, who was the son of Ahasuerus, Dan. ix. 1, did not conquer Babylon till he was sixty-two years old, Ch. x. 31 ; so that during this period Babylon was not conquered ; consequently, the decree made by Cyrus could only have respect to the Jews, and not to rebuilding the city. Accordingly, we find that the city and the wall were not built in the reign of those three kings—Cyrus, Ahasuerus, and Darius. But in the reign of the fourth king, Artaxerxes, we find that Nehemiah was commanded to go to Jerusalem, to rebuild the city and the wall, Ch. ii. 17. Now the years that Cyrus, Ahasuerus, and Darius reigned, were *seventy* ; and we have authority from Scripture to say, that Artaxerxes lived to the *thirty-first year* of his reign, which amounts to one hundred and two : subtract *one hundred and two* from *five hundred and thirty-six*, the period when the Jews returned to Jerusalem, and it leaves *four hundred and thirty-four years* B. C. ; which was the commencement of the interval

when the commandment went forth to rebuild the city and the wall of Jerusalem ; and the end of that period, the time decreed when Christ was to make his appearance in the world.

It must also appear that the SEVEN WEEKS, or *forty-nine* years, do not make any part of that period from the going forth of the commandment to restore and rebuild the city ; because it is said, *From the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem, עד משיח gna'il Messiah, until Messiah the Prince, shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks: the street shall be built again, and the wall; that is, in sixty-two weeks and seven weeks, at the end of which sixty-nine weeks of the SEVENTY, the Messiah was to declare himself the Prince, Ruler, Governor, Leader, Captain; which he did at the end of the seven weeks, or forty-ninth year of his age, when he openly declared himself to be the Messiah, Luke iv. 21, This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears—The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind; to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord.* As the commandment to build the city and the wall, went not forth till the time of the fourth king of Persia, and as by virtue of this command the city and the wall were built; it must be evident that at the expiration of the *sixty-two weeks* from that period, the Messiah was to make his appearance ; and that אחרי *achree, afterwards*, or in process of time, as this word signifies, he was to be cut off. Thus does this word אחרי *achree*, refer to the term of the natural life of the Messiah, in connexion with the *sixty-two weeks*, ואחרי השבעים ושתים עשרה *ve achree hashabu'gim shishim rishnim yikaareeth* Messiah, and after sixty and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off. So that after the *sixty and two weeks*, or *four hundred and thirty-four years*, when the Messiah was to make his appearance, the *seven weeks, or forty-nine years* commenced; at the end of which period, having fulfilled all the commands required in the law, the last week of the *seventy* then commenced, in the midst of which week, or the last three years and a half, Messiah was to be cut off; and which being added to the *seven weeks, or forty-nine years*, makes the Messiah *fifty-two years and a half* old at the time of the crucifixion: when he finished the transgression, made an end of sin, reconciliation for iniquity, brought in everlasting righteousness, sealed up all vision and prophecy, and anointed the most holy.

It must appear to the intelligent reader, that on no ground

whatever can these difficult passages be understood, if the time be reckoned from the first year, or from any year of Cyrus; for if so, the *sixty-two weeks* would not reach to the time when the Messiah was to appear. If from the time of Darius, then in like manner the sixty-two weeks, or four hundred thirty-four years, would not reach to the birth of Christ; therefore, as it is evident that no Messiah appeared, according to the expectations of the Jews, before Christ—as he cannot now make his appearance, *to be cut off*, during the *continuance of the second temple*; the temple having been laid in ashes by Titus the Roman general, near two thousand years since; and as Christ came and was cut off at the expiration of the sixty-nine weeks and a half, during the *continuance of the second temple*, agreeably to the positive declaration of the prophet Haggai, ch. ii. 7, 9, as above—it is as evident that this prophecy of Daniel can only apply to Christ; that the going forth of the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem, in the reign of Artaxerxes, the fourth king of Persia, was the commencement of the *seventy weeks*, and the remainder SEVEN WEEKS AND A HALF, OF FIFTY-TWO YEARS AND A HALF, the true age of the Messiah, the Redeemer, at the crucifixion.

Hence it appears, that all the arguments urged by sceptics to the ministry of Christ, because it was not possible that such a general spread of the gospel to so many distant nations should have taken place in the short period of three years, can no more be brought forward in support of the objection. But the foundation for these objections has been laid by writers, who have drawn their proofs from the gospels where they have read the particulars of *four passovers* before the crucifixion; not supposing that many passovers were signified in those words of the Apostle John, who was an eye and an ear witness to every miracle he recorded.

Hence it must be allowed, that as the Messiah came *to fulfil all righteousness*, as he said to St. John when he submitted to baptism, and as a *part of this righteousness* for which there was an express command under the Mosaic dispensation, for those who were chosen to officiate in the ministry, from thirty years old to fifty, Numb. iv. 3; so Christ fulfilled this law: he entered on his ministry at thirty years of age, and thus continued till the forty-ninth year, when he began to be persecuted, was cast out of the temple, and was crucified in the *midst of the week*, agreeably to the words of Daniel. And this time of his persecution was undoubtedly the last three years and a half of his life, the particulars of which we have in the gospels, otherwise it could not have been said by the Apostle St. John, *And there were also many*

other things which Jesus did, the which if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written. This is sufficient to convince the most obstinate contender, that all those things related of Christ could not be done in three years. Thus he put an end to the SACRIFICE, AND THE OBLATION, the ceremonies and ordinances of the Mosaic dispensation: thus he for ever abolished the typical Jubilee, or *forty-ninth* year; and by the abolition of these ceremonies, types, and figures, he taught that the worship of God did not consist in these external forms, but that to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat rams.

The Jubilee, which was observed among the ancient Hebrews, was most religiously celebrated at the end of the typical *forty-nine* years. The lands of individuals, which could not be mortgaged for a longer period, returned to the family to whom they originally belonged; all contracts and engagements were at an end, and it was a time of universal liberty.

The word יובל *yobeel*, is said by the Rabbinical writers to mean a *ram*, and therefore we so frequently find mention made of the *rams'-horns*, or *Jubilee trumpets*; from this word comes the word *Jubilee*. It had been an ancient custom, when the Hebrews first went into Egypt, to celebrate the feast of the slain lamb. Epiphanius says 'that the Egyptians at the vernal equinox celebrated the feast of the slain lamb, by smearing the trees and other things with the color of blood, in order to preserve them from some disaster.' This had been handed down to the Hebrews from the most ancient patriarchal churches; it was the first sacrifice that was commanded to be observed from the fall, as representative of the Messiah, the lamb slain from the foundation of the world.

The Hebrews also celebrated the feast of the slain lamb at the vernal equinox, to commemorate their deliverance from the Egyptian bondage. This sacrifice was also understood to refer to *Shiloh*, to whom the gathering of the people was to be, Gen. xlix. 10, and by Daniel to the Messiah, ch. ix. who was to *bring in everlasting righteousness* at the end of the *seven weeks*, or *forty-nine* years; at which time the gentile Jubilee was to commence in the *seventieth week*, when the *sacrifice* and the *oblation* were to cease for ever, when all dependence on *sacrifices*, *types*, *ceremonies*, and *oblations*, was to be abolished by the Redeemer, to whom all the prophets gave witness, who was to *seal the vision and prophecy*, i. e. the fulfilment of all prophecy concerning himself. St. Luke says, *Now in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius.*

It appears from various remarks in the History of the Romans, and also from the first Christian fathers, that Tiberius reigned in conjunction with Augustus, some years before the death of the latter, on account of his age; that he was associated with him in the supreme government; and that the 15th year of Tiberius, mentioned by St. Luke, applies to the proconsulate, and not to the 15th year after he became sole emperor.

I shall quote a few of the Roman historians, who have informed us, that Tiberius was taken into the government before the death of Augustus.

Velleius Paterculus¹ lived in the reign of the Emperors Augustus and Tiberius, and he says, 'that at the desire of Augustus a law was passed by the senate, that Tiberius might be taken into the joint government with Augustus.' And Tacitus observes, 'that Tiberius was joint Emperor with Augustus.'² Also Suetonius, 'There was a law made, that Tiberius should govern jointly with Augustus, and make the census with him.'³ And Dio observes, 'Augustus, being now much advanced in years, and incapable of rendering those services to the government for which he had been so eminent, recommended Germanicus to the senate, and the senate to Tiberius.'⁴ Augustus then accepted for the fifth time the government of the state for ten years, and renewed also the tribunician power to Tiberius.' For Augustus, on account of his great age, could not attend the senate and councils; and a decree was passed, that whatever was enacted by Augustus and Tiberius, with the council, should be ratified and deemed of equal authority, as if enacted by the authority of the senate.

Dio also says, that before the death of Augustus, the title of Emperor was given to Tiberius by a decree of the senate. Besides, we find by the Greek and Roman writers, that the title of Emperor was always given to those who were admitted to the proconsular and tribunician power. Titus and Trajan were honored with the title of Emperor, during the life and government of Vespasian and Nerva. Josephus, describing the triumph of Vespasian and Titus, says, 'the Emperors, the night before the triumph, lodged near the temple of Isis.'⁵ Philostratus says, that 'Titus was proclaimed Emperor in Rome, and admitted to equal power in the government with his father.'⁶ And

¹ Panegy. c. 11. laudat. a Pagio. Critic. A. ch. 11. n. 111.

² Tacit. An. lib. i. cap. 3. ³ Suet. in Tiber. cap. 20, 21.

Dio, i. 56. p. 587. ⁵ Joseph. de Bell. lib. vii. c. 5. p. 1305. v. 2.

⁶ Philost. vit. Apollonit, lib. vi. c. 30. p. 269.

the elder Pliny, who wrote before the death of Vespasian, and dedicated his work to Titus, calls Titus emperor.¹

From these remarks it must appear that Tiberius was admitted to the administration of the government in conjunction with Augustus, and that at least fifteen years before the death of Augustus. For, according to Origen,² ‘the Christians universally in his time were sensible that there were two epochs of the reign of Tiberius; if not, (as Lardner and other writers have justly observed) when they said that Christ was crucified in the fifteenth year of Tiberius, at which time the two Gemini were consuls, after he had preached for the time of the passovers mentioned in the gospels, they certainly must have known that they would have opposed the Apostle when he said, the word of God came to the Baptist in the *fifteenth year of Tiberius*: for the ministry of John began before that of Christ.’ This authority of Origen and Clemens cannot be resisted; for as it is evident that Christ was not crucified in the *fifteenth year* of Tiberius, it is as evident that this *fifteenth year* of the reign of Tiberius, when Christ is said to be about thirty years of age, was not the *fifteenth year* of his reign when he was sole emperor, but the fifteenth year of his proconsular empire, when he reigned in conjunction with Augustus. It is expressly said, *And it came to pass in those days, that there went out a decree from Caesar Augustus, that all the world should be taxed*, Luke ii. 1. And again in the third chapter, *And Jesus himself began to be about thirty years of age, which was in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar*, ver. 1. This decree therefore went out before the birth of Christ, when Augustus was sole emperor, consequently before Tiberius was taken into the joint administration. Now it appears from the Roman writers above quoted, that Tiberius was joint emperor with Augustus many years before the death of the latter, who dying at the advanced age of near eighty years, was incapable of governing long before he died. But if we were to understand by the fifteenth year of Tiberius the fifteenth year of his sole empire after the death of Augustus, it would not agree with any of the above authorities; as it would make Augustus perfectly capable of governing to within a year of his death, which is contradicted by the decree of the senate. It is also in opposition to the declaration of

¹ Plin. in Præfat.

² Orig. cont. Cels. l. ii. p. 67.—And Phil. p. 4. Also Clem. Alex. Strom. l. i. p. 340. A.

Irenæus, whose authority must be allowed to be great. Consequently the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius, when Christ was THIRTY YEARS OF AGE, must necessarily mean the fifteenth year of his proconsular tribunician empire. And as Christ was crucified about the end of the reign of Tiberius, who reigned 22 years, and not 17 only, as has been asserted, it follows from this also, that when Christ was crucified, he was fifty-two years and a half old.

This statement will agree with the remarks on the seventy weeks mentioned in Daniel, and with the law respecting those who were admitted to the ministry, Numb. iv. 47. *From thirty years old and upward, even unto fifty years old, every one that came to do the service of the ministry.* And also with Irenæus, the disciple of Polycarp, a disciple of St. John; who says, that Christ was about fifty years old at his crucifixion: for he has not the authority of John only; he gives the various testimony of all the old men who had lived with the apostle in Asia, and who had received this account from him; some of whom, he says, had seen the other apostles also, and had heard the same from them all. This is corroborated by the Jews, who said, *Thou art not yet fifty years old*; for it must appear that if he had been but *thirty years of age*, a remark of this kind would have been absurd. But as they were all registered in their synagogues at the age of *eight days*, the Jews were well acquainted with the age of Christ at this period, and therefore could with propriety say, having the register before them in the temple, THOU ART NOT YET FIFTY YEARS OLD.

To conclude; it must be allowed that Christ came to fulfil the whole law, in every particular rite and ceremony; for he said, *Suffer it to be so now; for it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness.* This was the rite of baptism, an ancient rite in the Jewish church, which, though unimportant as it respected him, yet was observed by him. So it was ordained under that dispensation, that those employed in any part of the service relating to the ministry, should be so employed *from thirty to fifty years of age*, even those who read, but were not of the priesthood. Consequently had he not so continued till the *fiftieth year of his age*, he would have been deficient in one of the principal ordinances, and, in such case, could not have *fulfilled all righteousness.*

The Hebrews read daily in the temple the old ceremonies, as at this day; but Christ taught daily in the temple; he sat among the readers, and preached the gospel, Luke xx. 1; showing by the prophecies that the time was come for the appearance of the Messiah, and at length told them, *This day is this scrip-*

ture fulfilled in your ears, Luke iv. 21. *The spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord,* Isa. lxi. 1, 2. Thus he was found perfect in every ordinance, rite and ceremony required in the law, even circumcision, baptism, &c. and also (as observed) completed the whole term of twenty years, which was commanded to those who taught in the temple, and fulfilled a part of the righteousness so commanded to be observed. He had taught a long time in the temple when he was finally manifested, at the forty-ninth year of his age, at the commencement of the last three years; for the Baptist knew him well when he came to be baptised, Matt. iii. 4. Thus during twenty years of his reading and teaching in the temple, he convinced a great body of the people; for they said, *No man ever spake like this man; chose twelve apostles; a Christian sanhedrim of seventy disciples, and sent them forth to preach the gospel; which was improbable to be done in the short space of three years.* Thus it appears that the observation of the Jews, respecting his age, *thou art not yet fifty years old*, had reference to the time, or latter end of his life, when he came publicly forward in the temple, and declared who he was in the words of the prophet; and at the commencement of the last passovers, which alone are recorded in the gospels. For we find that the gospels do not contain the transactions of his life from the beginning of his ministry. This is ascertained by St. John: *And there were also many other things which Jesus did, the which if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain (receive) the books that should be written.* These words evidently refer to things done in his public ministry, which are not recorded in the gospels, and which are said to be of so extraordinary a nature, and so numerous, that it was not possible any of them were here referred to as performed in the last three years of his life; but as having been done from the time of his entering on his public ministry in the *thirtieth year of his age*, to the time of his publicly opposing all the combined power, authority and learning of the priests, scribes, and pharisees, at the beginning of the last three years of his life. Then it was that the Redeemer finished the *seventy weeks determined on the people, and on the holy city.* For agreeably to this astonishing prophecy, at the end of the *seventy weeks, or four hundred and ninety years*, the people were scattered into all nations, and the HOLY CITY

was laid in ashes by the Romans. HE MADE AN END OF SINS, viz. of *atonements* for sins by sacrifice.—HE MADE RECONCILIATION FOR INIQUITY, by showing the old paradisaical way to the tree of life, a life consistent with those divine precepts which he taught; and thus HE BROUGHT IN EVERLASTING RIGHTEOUSNESS, by showing that the life of Christ, manifested in the heart and life of the Christian, was to sweep away all the old *sacrifices, types, oblations* and *ceremonies*, which were made the temporary righteousness of that day; and that this righteousness established by the Christian dispensation was to endure forever. HE SEALED UP THE VISION AND PROPHECY; that is, he accomplished all that was *said in the books of Moses, and in the Psalms, and in the Prophets, concerning himself*. No prophets were for ever after him to arise; THE VISION AND PROPHECY WERE FOR EVER SEALED. HE ANOINTED THE MOST HOLY—by his *doctrines* and *life*, showing the Jews of that day, that their dependence on their offerings of sheep and bullocks would not atone for their evils of life; and also all Christians, that their attendance on outward ceremonies, and even their faith, without the life of Christ in the heart, would be but *as sounding brass and as the tinkling cymbal*.

NOTICE OF

ÆSCHYLI TRAGÆDIÆ: SUPPLICES *et*

EUMENIDES. Studio G. BURGES, M. A.

duod. 8s. et 7s.

UNDER the head of Literary Intelligence, we briefly announced in our last No., p. 440., two volumes of Mr. Burges's intended edition of the whole of Æschylus; we now enter on a more full examination of the first of these publications under the following title:

‘Αισχύλου Τραγωδιοποιού Λείψανα. Æschyli, quæ supersunt, Fabulæ et Fragmenta. Supplices. Ἐκ νηκτὸς μελαίνης ὄρσαι φάος. Recensui Georgius Burges; cujus Notæ aliorumque seliguntur editæ, et ineditæ divulgantur. Londini. Ex ædibus Valpianis, apud G. et W. B. Whittaker, Payne et Foss, et Bibliopolas Cantabrigiæ et Oxonii.’

Connected as the name of Mr. Burges has been publicly with this Journal, we fear that we may be thought incapable of acting the part of unbiassed judges. We are convinced, however, that in the whole of this article, we shall prove that a Review may be written with truth, alike removed from the hood-winked affection that sees no faults, and the sharp-eyed animosity which finds nothing to praise.

To keep ourselves thus within the limits, *quos ultra citraque nequit consistere rectum*, we know to be a task of no common difficulty. In proof of this, we need only refer to the pages of a contemporary Journal, the chief writer of which is avowedly the literary opponent of Mr. Burges, and has published the following *impartial* notice of his adversary's edition.

‘Mr. George Burges has written a new Greek play, which he entitles the Supplices of Æschylus. As it does not fall within our plan to criticise the classical compositions of modern authors, we shall abstain from any remarks upon this ingenious production, and content ourselves with giving one specimen of his successful imitation of Æschylus.

Æschylus, Suppl. 143.

θέλουσα δ' αὖ θέλουσαν ἀγνάν μ'
ἐπιδέτω Διὸς κόρα·
ἔχουσα σέμν' ἐνώπι' ἀσφαλὲς
παντὶ δὲ σθένουσι δι-
ωγμοῖσι δ' ἀσφαλίᾳς
ἄδμήτας ἄδμήτα
ρύσιος γενέσθω.

Burges.

φιλοῦσα δ' αὖ φιλοῦσαν ἀγν-
άν μ' ἐπιδέτω Διὸς κόρα,
ἔχουσα σέμν' ἐνώπι' ἐς φίλας
πάντα δ' ἀσθενεῖς δι-
ωγμ' εἰς ἀφιλίας·
σύ δ' ἄδμῆς ἄδμῆτος
ρύσιος γενέσθω.

We rather think, however, that Æschylus would have preferred *σύ γενοῦ* to *σύ γενέσθω*; but, perhaps, Mr. Burges recollected the precept, *nec desilies imitator in arctum*, &c. The notes are equally remarkable for sound criticism, good feeling, and elegant Latinity.”

Although we know something, perhaps, of the motives, which led Mr. Burges to declare against Dr. Blomfield, πόλεμον ἀσπονδον καὶ ἀκήρυκτον, yet we regret, as cordially as the friends of Dr. Blomfield can, the manner and the place, in which Mr. Burges has chosen to exhibit his hostility. If there be the least value in scholarship, let not that little be reduced to nothing, as it deserves to be, by making the notes on a dead author the vehicle of abuse on a living editor. To the truth of this sentiment, too long neglected by critics, Mr. Burges seems (and we hail the change with infinite delight) to have been subsequently alive; and in the Fume-

nides he has, with a candor, not the less valuable for its rarity, endeavored to make the *amende honorable* to Dr. Blomfield, by correcting a mistake, into which he appears to have fallen in the *Supplices*, p. 227, by there accusing the Doctor of having deceived a bookseller, by passing off as his own observations some notes on the *Troades* of Euripides, which were, in fact, only extracts from Mr. Burges' notes on the same play.

With respect to the charge made against Mr. Burges's Latinity, we conceive more stress is laid on that point by the Reviewer than good sense warrants. Had Mr. Burges edited a Latin author, his supposed ignorance of Latinity might have been pleaded against his competency to the task he had undertaken; but, as in the present case he has given his attention to a Greek author, the very confession of the Reviewer, that Mr. Burges has written a Greek play, is some proof that he is not so ignorant of that language as the Reviewer would lead us to believe, from his detection of a solitary error in Greek syntax. For our own part, we confess that we consider the Latinity a very secondary object. Provided the meaning of the writer be clear, we ask no more: fine writing, as Dr. Blomfield properly remarks in the *Quarterly Review*, No. xv. p. 223, and 'flowers of rhetoric, are misplaced in discussions on the position of an accent, the luxation of a dochmiac, or the hallucination of some sinful copyist.' Our best notions of a Latin style in all its varied stages of excellence, must be derived from other writers than even the Ciceronian Muretus and his editor Ruhnken; who, in his choice and collocation of words, was deemed *instar omnium*, till Wolf showed us spots even in the sun of Ruhnken. Yet though the value due to Latinity is small, still as excellence even in minor points is desirable, we will in the words of Mr. Elmsley, in the *Edinburgh Review*, No. xxxiii. p. 224, addressed to then Mr., now Dr., Blomfield, advise Mr. Burges, 'if he survive the effects of his Reviewer's sneers, to guard himself against similar attacks of his competitor. For of all the possible defects of a writer, grammatical errors are the least important, the soonest detected, and the last forgotten. Thousands of readers exist who are stone-blind as to the presence or absence of genius, judgment, learning, sagacity, taste, candor, and right reasoning, but possess a Lyncean quickness of vision with regard to false concords.'

By a little attention to points of this nature, Mr. Burges might have avoided the portentous error of *tentantur* for *tentant*, and more particularly have shown himself a greater master

of the complicated difficulties of the subjunctive mood, that stumbling-block to all tra-montane writers of Latin.

With regard to the Reviewer's objection against the want of soundness of criticism in Mr. Burges's *Supplices*, we fear that the bold style of criticism adopted in the *Supplices* is likely to impede the sale of the publication; and we confess that, in spite of all that has been done and said by the Scaligers and Bentleys in favor of their *slashing* system, our prejudices are still on the side of the less venturous method of leaving the texts of ancient authors in the same state as they are found in MSS., and of reserving for the notes all the suggestions of emendations, be their character for ingenuity and probability what it may.

If, however, on any occasion we were disposed to depart from a strict adherence to this rule of sound criticism, we know not to what play the exception might be granted with greater right than to the *Supplices* of *Æschylus*. For of all the remains of Greek Tragedy, so miserable is the condition of that drama, that the united exertions of more than three centuries have been unable to present the least idea of the production of that *Æschylus*, who found in his country's admiration of his genius after death, the best, the latest, reward for merit acknowledged during his life.

But whatever might be the delight of the author, were he alive again, at finding that, though his mortal remains had been consigned to mother earth, his spirit still breathed with some portion of its original fire in his other plays, how wofully would he be disappointed, were he told to search for his *Supplices* amidst the chaotic mass of Greek letters, which pass under the name of that play. Whether he would be able to recognise his own production in that of the present editor, may be questionable; but not a shadow of doubt can remain, as to his immediate rejection of all the nonsense attributed to him in previous editions; nor would he fail to acknowledge, that in desperate cases, desperate remedies alone were capable of effecting a *radical* cure.

Thus much has justice compelled us to say on the subject of these angry bickerings, which, our fervent prayer is, *requiescant in pace*, as well for the sake of the parties themselves, as of that of Literature, which the rival editors of *Æschylus* singly pursue with so much zeal, and which they might, if united, contribute, each in his own way, to advance to the proud pre-eminence due to the immortal language of the sons of Greece. Nor is it with little pain that we have noticed this attempt to decry, by a sneer,

the labors of an individual, whose first, last, and only wish seems to be, to promote the cause of Grecian Literature, and particularly whatever is connected with its dramatic productions.

Such are the points, in which Mr. Burges has laid himself open to censure. We turn, then, to the more favorable side of the picture. And here we must admire the manliness and honesty in Mr. Burges' conduct, who, disdaining the tricks of vanity, in concealing real ignorance under the garb of a studied reserve, has every where made a full confession of the difficulties of his author, by the simple formula, *hæc non intelligo*, or *nihil hic video*; and, instead of wasting his own reader's patience by a useless attempt at unsatisfactory explanation, has at once given what he believes to be the nearest approach to the original text of his author. By these means he has presented us with, at least, a readable play; a consideration of some importance to those who have endeavored, hitherto, to wade through that slough of despond, the Supplices of Æschylus, with what success let that man, if such exists, alone say, who will boldly assert that he can truly understand a dozen continued lines of this drama in other editions.

The contents of Mr. Burges' volume are, 1. a dedication; 2. the preface; 3. the text according to the Editor's recension; 4. the preface to the notes; 5. the notes; and lastly, an Index of authors emended.

The dedication we extract, as conveying a piece of biography, from which we infer, that Mr. Burges seems to be the first native Asiatic who has appeared in the character of an editor of Greek plays: '*Genio Scholæ Carthusianæ, Græcus Literas assidue olim colentis, neque minus in posterum, si quid audiendum loquor, cultæ. Æschyli reliquias hasce, veluti tabulas e naufragio collectas redintegratasque, dedico Georgius Burges, Bengulensis.*'

In the preface, Mr. Burges enters on two questions, not so much in their nature novel, as useful in their application, respecting the causes of corruption in ancient authors. The first alludes to the change of lines, produced by the method adopted by different transcribers, of writing the verses in one, two, or three columns; and the second to the discovery of *lacunæ*, and the means of supplying them. Of both these fruitful sources of error, instances are given from Æschylus and Sophocles; and with the proofs of similar lacunæ and similar supplements, discovered by others, a hint is given that Valckenaer in some MS. notes has anticipated Mr. Burges in similar discoveries in the Helena of Euripi-

des. The passages to which the Dutchman and Bengalee allude, will be shortly, we hope, made known by Matthiæ, who appears to have had access to the Valckenaer paper.

The supplement, introduced by Mr. Burges, from Clemens Alexandrinus, of the Ajax of Sophocles, we deem no less curious than certain; since, as Mr. B. remarks, not only does the sense require the words supplied, but the supplement itself points out the cause of the *lacuna*. We earnestly recommend the admirers of Sophocles, and amongst the readers of Greek who do not admire the tragic bee, to turn to Mr. Burges' Pref. p. 11 and following.

Equally certain in fact, though less supported by circumstantial evidence, is the supplement discovered by Mr. B. of a verse, which, attributed wrongly to Archilochus by Ammonius, manifestly belongs to Æschylus, and could not possibly have been found in a more fit place than where Mr. B. has put it; and by so doing, with the aid of some verbal emendations, simple and necessary, has he cleared up one of the most *tenebrose* passages in the whole play. The story runs thus:

Danaus, having fled from Egypt, arrives with his daughters at Argos; and at the close of the hymn, sung by the Chorus on their first entrance upon the stage, he gives his daughters some good advice, as to their conduct in a strange land. To this lecture the Danaïdes reply as becomes dutiful children, and hold the following discourse with their father; who endeavours to cheer the drooping spirits of his children, by bidding them pray to, and put their trust in, the gods, whom they saw represented as guardians of the holy place, where they were seated as suppliants.

- ΧΟ. πάτερ φρονούντως πρὸς φρονούντας ἐπέεσσιν
φυλάξομαι δὲ τὰςδε μεμνήσθαι σίθιν
κεδνάς ἐφ' ἑταίρας· Ζεὺς δὲ γιγνήτωρ μ' ἴδοι. 195
- ΔΑ. ἴδοιτο δῆτα πριυμενοῦς σ' ἀπ' ὀμματος·
- ΧΟ. ὦ Ζεῦ κόπων μ' οἴκτιρε, μὴ ἀπέλα λιτάς·
- ΔΑ. κίονυ θείοντος, εὖ τελευτήσεις τάδε·
- ΧΟ. θέλει μ', ἐν Αἰδῇ ἵσται τίλος, θρήνους ἔχειν·
- ΔΑ. μὴ νῦν σφάδαζε, μὴ κεμήεις τ' ἔσται κρατος· 200
- ΧΟ. τίν' οὖν κικλήσκω τῷ τε δαιμόνων ἑπι·
- ΔΑ. ἀγνώ γ' Ἀπόλλω, φυγάδ' ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ θιόν·
εἰδώς ἂν αἴσαν τήνδε συγγνήην βροτοῖς·
- ΧΟ. σύγγονοι δῆτα καὶ παρασταῖη πρόφρων
καλοῦσιν αὐγὰς Ἥλιου σωτηρίου· 205
- ΔΑ. καὶ Ζηὺς ὄρνι τόνδε—
- ΧΟ. ὄρνι, πρίαιναν τήνδε— σημεῖον θεοῦ
- ΔΑ. γῦν κικλήσκειτι·
- ΧΟ. τρίαῖνά τ' ἰσθλὴ καὶ κυβερνήτης σοφός·
- ΔΑ. ἔλκεδ' εὖ τ' ἔτι μεψιν—

ΧΟ.	εἷ τε δεξιάσθω χθονι.	
ΔΑ.	Ἑρμῆς θ' ὅδ' ἄλλος τοῖσδ' ἐν Ἑλλήνων νόμοις--	210
ΧΟ.	ἁλλοθρόοις νῦν ἐσθλὰ κηρυκεύεται.	
ΔΑ.	ἡμεῖς δὲ βωμὸν τόνδε καὶ πυρὸς σέλας κύκλιον περιστήτ', ἐν λόχῳ δ' ἁπείρου θεῶν ἀνέκτων τήνδε κοινοβωμίαν σεῖβεσθ'.	215

Such is the intelligible form which the words of Æschylus assume in Mr. Burges' scdition; how different is their appearance elsewhere, we are almost ashamed, for the disgrace of criticism, to state. Respecting the charges made by Mr. B. in the first three lines of this extract, nothing need be said; as they are sufficiently confirmed by the authority of the better MSS. or editions; but with regard to the alterations, transpositions, and insertions adopted by Mr. B. in the remaining part of this extract, the Editor must speak for himself in his notes; which cannot be introduced at length, without trespassing too much on the patience of our readers; nor abridged, without doing injustice to the Editor's learning; and from which it will be seen, that although Mr. B. has, like Mr. Winsor, the inventor of gas-light, entered on a bold and hazardous speculation, in his endeavor *non fumum ex fulgore, sed ex fumo dare lucem*, he has still come out from the furnace of criticism unscathed; nor can it be said of him, as of the aspiring Phaethon, *magnis hic excidit ausis*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

THE Library of Mr. PERRY, late Editor of the Morning Chronicle, was brought to the hammer under Mr. EVANS' care, of Pall Mall, during this month. The Collection was rich in old English Literature, particularly in *facetiæ*. The following are a few of the most prominent articles, with prices, purchasers, &c.—As a portion only of the Library is yet sold, we shall return to this article in our next No.

Arthur of Little Britain, translated by Lord Berners, edited by Uttersson, *with two sets of plates, one colored and the other plain*, 1814. 5l. 10s. Anderson.

Ages of Sin, with its Steps from Thought to Impenitence, *nine plates, with English verses under them*, rare. 5*l.* 10*s.* Rodd.

Argall's Song of Songs, which was Salomons, with certaine of the Brides Ornaments, viz. *Poetical Essayes, very scarce*, 1621. 3*l.* 12*s.* Rodd.

British Antidote to Caledonian Poison, *Satirical Political Prints and Poems*, 1762. 2*l.* 5*s.* Molteno.

Bankes Bay Horse in a Trance, a discourse set downe in a merry dialougue, between Bankes and his beast: ahatomizing some abuses and bad trickes of this age, *with the wood cut*, extremely rare, 1595. 9*l.* 9*s.* Jolley.

. For an account of this very curious and Rare Shakspeare Tract see Reed's Shakspeare, vol. vii. p. 27 and 28.

Barlow's Columbiad, *plates by Smirke, proof impressions, green morocco, Philadelphia*, 1807. 3*l.* Laing.

Buttes's Dyets Dry Dinner, rare, 1599. 3*l.* Jolley.

Banquet of Jests or Change of Cheare, a collection of Jests, Witty Jeeres, Merry Tales, &c. rare, *with a tracing of the portrait of Archee the King's Jester, by Mr. Brand*, blue morocco, 1639. 3*l.* 10*s.* Warder.

Bastard's Seven Bookes of Epigrames, a Poetical Volume of Extraordinary Rarity, with a Ms. Epigram in an Old Hand-writing, 1598. 10*l.* 10*s.* Hall.

Bodenham's Belvedere, or the Garden of the Muses, *Poems, first edition*, excessively rare, 1600. 6*l.* 6*s.* Rodwell.

N. Breton's small handfull of fragrant flowers fit for any honorable Gentlewoman to smell unto, *Poems, very rare, yellow morocco*, 1575. 10*l.* 12*s.* 6*d.* Thorpe.

Barksdale's Nympha Libethris, or the Cotswold Muse, extremely rare, 1651. 5*l.* Rodwell.

Baltharpe's Straights Voyage, or St. David's Poems, *very scarce*, 1671. 3*l.* 10*s.* Thorpe.

This Boke is named The Beaultie of Women, a poem, extremely rare, from the Roxburgh Collection, *morocco, Imprinted by Robert Wyer*. 16*l.* 16*s.* Jolley.

Nicholas Breton's Floorish upon Fancie and Toyes of an Idle Heade, containing many pretie pamphlets to passe away idle time withall, extremely rare, *Imprinted by Jhones*, 1577. 28*l.* 17*s.* 6*d.* Thorpe.

Nicholas Breton's Britton's Boure of Delights, contayning many most delectable and fine Devices of rare Epitaphes, pleasant Poems, Pastorals and Sonets, *in morocco, Imprinted by Jhones*, 1591. 26*l.* 15*s.* 6*d.* Triphook.

. This very Rare volume contains, among other pleasing productions of Breton's Muse, the first edition of his beautiful little poem "Phyllis and Corydon."

Nicholas Breton's Pasquils passe and passeth not, set downe in three Peees, his Passe, Precession and Prognostication, a poem, *green morocco*, 1600. 8*l.* 10*s.* 6*d.* Jolley.

Nicholas Breton's Olde Man's Lesson, and a Young Man's Love, 1605. 5*l.* 5*s.* Hull.

N. Breton, the Soules immortall crowne consisting of seaven glorious graces, Vertue, Love, Constancie, &c. *Poems, with an engraved border round each page, in morocco*, 1605. 6*l.* 17*s.* 6*d.* Rodd.

N. Breton, The Mother's Blessing, a poem, 1621. 5*l.* 17*s.* 6*d.* Rodd.

N. Breton, Sir Philip Sydney's Ourania, that is Endimion's Song and Tragedie, 1606. 3*l.* 6*s.* Rodd.

Buck's Daphnis Polustephanos, an eclog, *very scarce*, 1605. 3*l.* 6*s.* Thorpe.

— Great Plantagenet, a poem, *blue morocco*, 1635. 2*l.* 18*s.* Skegg.

Bateman, the Travailed Pilgrime, bringing newes from all partes, a poem, extremely rare, *plates, blue morocco*, 1569. 26*l.* 15*s.* 6*d.* Hall.

Barley-Breake, or a Warning for Wantons, a poem, by W. N. rare, 1607. 5*l.* Rodwell.

Baldwin's Funerall of King Edward the Sixt, a poem, rare, with portrait of Edward VI. *Imprinted by Marshe*, 1560. 14*l.* 14*s.* Wilson.

* * At the beginning of this volume is inserted a single leaf with an engraved border, *imprinted by Copland*, containing a Prayer for Edward the Sixth's Recovery, commanded by the Erle of Bedford to be used by all trew subjects.

Old Ballads, Songs, and Humorous Pieces, from the late Duke of Norfolk's Library, forming a very large volume. 9*l.* 9*s.* Thorpe.

Ballads, Songs, and Poems, in a folio volume. 7*l.* Thorpe.

Bercley, here begynneth a ryght frutefull Treatyse, intituled the Myrrour of Good Maners, or Cardynall Vertues, compyled in Latyn by Mancyn, and translated into *Englysshe Verse, blue morocco*. Imprinted by Pynson, at the request of the Yerie of Kent. 9*l.* Thorpe.

Barclay's Ship of Fooles, Mirrour of Good Maners, and Egloges, *wood cuts, fine copy, in russia*. Imprinted by Cawood, 1570. 8*l.* 5*s.* Jolley.

Biblia Sacra Latina, 2 vol. first edition of the Holy Scriptures, and the first book executed by the inventors of printing, with moveable metal types. Printed at Mentz by Gutenberg and Fust, between the years 1450 and 1455. 168*l.* Pettigrew.

* * This edition is generally known by the name of the Mazarine Bible, from the first discovery of a copy in Cardinal Mazarine's Library, by that eminent Bibliographer Debure. It is printed in double columns, in imitation of the large letters employed by the Scribes in the Church Missals and Choir Books. *It would be superfluous to expatiate on the extreme rarity and importance of this article. It must always form the most prominent feature in a Collection of Books of the XVth century; for what book can be more interesting to the Collector, than the first production of the Art of Printing?* In contemplating this work the mind is lost in astonishment; that the Inventors of Printing should, by a single effort, have exhibited the perfection of their art. The firmness of the paper, the brightness of the ink, the exact uniformity of the impression have never been surpassed. Trithemius says, in his Chronicle, that he was told by Peter Schouffer, (the partner and son-in-law of Fust,) that *this edition was executed about the year 1450*, and that the expenses incurred in the printing were so enormous, that 4000 florins were expended before 12 sheets had been printed.

Coryat's Crudities hastily gobbled up in his Travels, *with frontispiece and plates, in russia*, 1611. 4*l.* 5*s.* Atkinson.

Constable's Diana or Sonnets, *privately printed by Mr. E. Littledale for the use of the Roxburghe Club*, 1818. 3*l.* 9*s.* Thorpe.

Chute's Beawtie Dishonoured, written under the title of Shores Wife, 1593. 26*l.* Jolley.

* * This copy formerly belonged to G. Steevens, who has written a note in it, that he had *never seen another Copy*.

Cowley's Poetical Blossomes, *with the rare portrait by Vaughan*, also a small portrait inserted, *blue morocco*, 1633. 4*l.* Freeling.

Cranley's Amanda, or the Reformed Whore, in verse and prose, *very scarce*. 1635. 4l. 5s. Hodges.

Cow—Ragious Castle Combat, a poem, 1645. 2l. 13s. Thorpe.

Christian Praiers, called Queen Elizabeth's Prayer Book, *with engraved borders representing the Dance of Death, and portrait of Elizabeth, in morocco*, 1608. 3l. 13s. 6d. Hodges.

Churchyard's Light Bondel of Livly Discourses, called his Charge, a poem, *very rare, in morocco*, 1580. 14l. Triphook.

Christie on Etruscan Vases, privately printed, *scarce, splendidly bound in blue morocco*, 1806. 8l. 15s. Hering.

Constantini Lexicon Græco-Latinum, *best edition, in russia*, 1592. 6l. 18s. Thorpe.

Commentarii locupletissimi Verborum Latinorum cum Græcis Angli-
cusque Conjunctorum, *scarce*, apud Bynneman, 1583. 5l. 2s. 6d. Thorpe.

Controverses des Sexes Masculin et Femenin, poeme, *cuts, ruled, red morocco*. Tholose par Colomies, 1534. 5l. Thorpe.

Davies (of Hereford's) Wit's Bedlam, Where is had Whipping Cheer to cure the Mad, *excessively rare*, 1617. 20l. 10s. Triphook.

Drunken Barnaby's Journal, first edition, *with the frontispiece by Marshall*, extremely rare, *blue morocco*, with some Latin Ms. verses relating to Oxford in Barnaby's manner in an old hand at the beginning and end of the volume. 3l. Thorpe.

Euripidis Hecuba, Hecuba editio altera, Orestes, Phœnissæ et Medea, Edente Porsono, 5 vol. fine paper copies, *which were never sold*. Presentations from Professor Porson to Mr. Perry, with Porson's writing in each volume, 1798, &c. 16l. 16s. W. Perry.

Dibdin's Typographical Antiquities, or History of English Printing, 4 vol. large paper, *plates*, 1809. 22l. 11s. 6d. Thorpe.

Ceremonies et Coutumes Religieuses de Tous les Peuples du Monde, avec les Superstitions Anciennes et Modernes, 11 vol. large paper, *plates by Picart, very beautiful impressions, remarkably fine and splendid copy, red morocco*. Amst. 1723. 63l. Thorpe.

Forme of Prayer and Ministration of the Sacraments, &c. used in the English Congregation at Geneva, and approved by Calvin, *very scarce, in russu*, Imprinted by Crcspin, 1556. 7l. 7s. Evans.

Davies (of Hereford's) Wittes Pilgrimage (by Poetical Essaies) through a World of Amorous Sonnets, Soule Passions, &c. *extremely rare*, London, by Browne. 28l. Thorpe.

Certaine English Verses, penned by David Gwyn, who for the space of eleven yeares and ten moneths was in most grievous servitude in the gallees under the King of Spaine, extremely rare. Mr. Bland supposed it to be unique, *green morocco, by Lewis*, Imprinted by Hudson, 1588. 12l. 12s. Jolley.

Patrick Hannay's Nightingale, Sheretine's Happy Husband, and other Poems, *frontispiece, including the rare portrait of the Author, and a portrait of Anne of Denmark, his Patroness, by Crispin de Pass, inserted*, extremely rare, *and one of the most curious and interesting volumes in the Collectiō.*, 1622. 38l. 6s. 6d. Triphook.

Father Hubbard's Tales, or the Ant and the Nightingale, extremely rare, 1604. 10l. 5s. Triphook.

Joseph Fletcher's Historie of the Perfect-Cursed-Blessed Man, a poem, extremely rare, *plates*, 1629. 16l. Evans.

Facciolati et Forcellini Lexicon Totius Latinitatis, 4 vol. in 2, *best edition, in russia, Patav. 1771.* Appendix ad Forcellini Lexicon, *Patav. 1816.* 10*l.* 10*s.* Bohn.

R. Greene's Menaphon Camillas alarum to slumbering Euphues, with sundrie conceived Passions, excessively rare, 1589. 15*l.* 15*s.* Triphook.

Golii Lexicon Arabico-Latinum, *Elzev. 1653.* 8*l.* 15*s.* Ogles.

Johnsoni Schediasmata Poetica. *This volume contains Epigrams on Gamaliel Ratsey, the celebrated Highwayman mentioned by Ben Jonson, and on Jane Shore, &c. extremely rare. Lond. 1615.* 6*l.* 12*s.* 6*d.* Thorpe.

Hickes's Thesaurus Veterum Linguarum Septentrionalium, 2 vol. *very fine copy, formerly Prince Soubise's, Oxon. 1705.* 12*l.* Rivington.

Johnson's Lives of Highwaymen, Murderers, Street Robbers, Pyrates, &c. *Portraits. 1734.* 5*l.* 7*s.* 6*d.* Thorpe.

Kemble's Fugitive Pieces, rare, *suppressed, York, 1780.* 5*l.* 18*s.* Matthews.

INSCRIPTIONES a Boeckhio expositæ in Indice Lectorum æstivarum Acad. Berolin. 1821.

I.

Lapis repertus Acharnæ.

ΕΠΙ ΘΕΟΦΡΑΣΤΟΥ
ΑΡΧΟΝΤΟΣ [Ο]ΡΟΣ
ΧΩΡΙΟΥ ΤΙΜΗΣ
ΕΝΟΦΕΙΛΟΜΕΝ
ΗΣ ΦΑΝΟΣΤΡΑΤΩΙ
ΠΑΙΑΝ ΧΧ

II.

Lapis situs in Campo Marathonio.

. ΟΡΟΣ ΧΩΡΙΟΥ
ΚΑΙ ΟΙΚΙΑΣ ΑΠΟΤ[Ι]
ΜΗΜΑ ΠΑΙΔΙ ΟΡΦ[Α]
ΝΩΙ ΔΙΟ ΓΕΙΤΟΝΟΣ
ΠΡΟΒΑ

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

LATELY PUBLISHED.

Stephens' Greek Thesaurus, Nos. XIV. and XV., and on the 1st of May, No. XVI. The whole work will be completed within 4 years.

Delphin and Variorum Classics, Nos. XXXVII. and XXXVIII. containing Nepos and Phædrus. Pr. 1*l.* 1*s.* per No.; 1. p. double.

Mr. Valpy has just published for the use of Schools an Edition of *Juvenal and Persius* with English Notes, pr. 5*s.* 6*d.* duod. The same Edition without Notes, pr. 3*s.* 6*d.*

A New *Greek and English Lexicon* of the *New Testament*, for the use of Schools. By the Rev. H. LAING, L.L.D. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

Dr. LAING has, in our opinion, conferred a signal service on the Greek student. His work is greatly superior to Dawson's. He has carefully marked the quantity of the doubtful vowels, and has correctly given the signification and derivation of words. Some of his observations prove him to be an accurate scholar.

We would recommend him, in a future edition, to mark the doubtful vowels only when they are *long*. This would save much labor in the printing, and be equally satisfactory.

Notitia Librorum manu typisve descriptorum qui donante Ab. Thoma Valperga-Calusio V. Cl. illati sunt in Reg. Taurinensis Athenæi Bibliothecam: bibliographica et critica descriptione illustravit, Anecdota passim inseruit Amadeus PEYRON. 4to. Lips. 1820.

The eighth edition of Dr. VALPY'S *Greek Grammar* is just printed; pr. 6*s.* 6*d.* For Schools and Students.

Lectiones Platonicæ. E membranis Bodleianis eruit T. GAISFORD, A.M. 8vo. Oxon. 1820.

Aristophanis Comædiæ quæ extant undecim ac deperditarum fragmenta, cum Scholiis Gr. et superiorum editorum, Kusteri, Bergleri, Brunckii, aliorumque VV. DD. suis item annotationibus edidit et lexicon in Aristophanem adjecit Chr. G. SCHUTZ. tom. primi pars 1. 11. 8vo. Lips. 1821.

The first part contains the Prefaces of Kuster, Burmann, Bergler and Brunck, with a very short one of the Editor's. Then follow the *Acharnenses*, *Equites* and *Nubes*, with the various readings and

Latin version, all in the same page. Part the second contains the Annotations.

Select British Divines, Part XIII. Containing Pearson on the Creed, pr. 2s. 6d. each No. (continued Monthly.) Edited by the Rev. C. BRADLEY.

Nos. I. and II. contain BEVERIDGE'S *Private Thoughts*; with a Portrait.—No. III. LEIGHTON'S *Theological Lectures*; with a Portrait.—No. IV. LEIGHTON'S *Expository Lectures*.—Nos. V. VI. VII. LEIGHTON'S *Commentary on St. Peter*.—Nos. VIII. IX. LEIGHTON'S *Sermons*.—Nos. X. XI. XII. HENRY'S *Tracts*; with a Portrait.

Each Author may be purchased separately, in Numbers or in Vols. boards.

A short Biographical Sketch of each Author is given.

Lucurgi Oratio in Leocratem ad Fidem Codicum Mss. adjecta Annotatione Critica recensuit FR. OSANN. Jenæ, 1821. pp. 176. 8vo.

The learned Editor in his Preface, which extends to the 18th page, notices the singular fact that "intra semestre spatium" had appeared three editions of Lycurgus, the first by Gerh. Becker, the second by C. F. Heinrich, and his own the last. He has largely availed himself of the aid, which the first edition supplied; but the second reached his hands just as he had arrived at almost the last leaf of his own edition. He has, however, appended to his Preface "Heinrichianæ lectionis varietatem." The Mss. used by Osann are the two, which form a part of the Burneian treasures in the British Museum, and one of which was brought to this country by that enterprising traveller Dr. E. D. Clarke, (whose death we are grieved to see just announced in the Newspapers.) The notes, with which Osann has adorned his edition, reflect great credit on his critical talents, and can scarcely fail to interest, in one way or other, scholars of every class. We select the following as a specimen:

"Τὰ ἱερὰ τὰ πατρῷα] Simonus, πατρῷα, ait, hic et πάτρια commutata sunt; quod equidem non dixerim. Demosth. Epist. 1481. Θύοντα ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν τὰς πατρώους θυσίας ἐν Δελφοῖς, de Cor. 274. Τὸν Ἀπόλλω τὸν Πύθιοι, ὃς πατρῷός ἐστι τῇ πόλει. Memoratur tamen Πάτριος Ἀπόλλων in Bekk. Anecd. 1, 291. Lesboux 48. Orell. πατρώας ἐστίας, 50. πατρώων θεῶν. Igitur quæ infra 178. leguntur, Τὰ ἱερὰ τὰ πάτρια, 201. Θεοὺς τοὺς πατρίους, potius crediderim cum τοῖς πατρώοις commutata esse. Multo enim latior est vocis πατρώος usus, quam ap. Latinos v. *Paternus*, quæ eo sensu nonnisi ap. poetas reperiatur: contra *Dii patrii*, Nepos Them. 6. Cic. Phil. 2, 30. Tam promiscuus autem et varius ap. Græcos harum vocum usus est, ut nonnisi in universum Godofr. Hermannii de iis præ-

cepta vera esse dicas, in *Classical Journal*, 42, 356. breviter scribentis :—‘ Πάτρια, Quæ sunt patris; πατρῶα, Quæ a patre veniunt; πατρικά, Qualia patris sunt.’ Quorum trium adjectivorum discrimen multo aliter traditur in Bekk. Lex. 217.” We hope shortly to direct the attention of our readers to other publications of Osann, whose industry deserves great praise, and whose erudition will always command our respect and ensure our good-will.

Theocriti Reliquiæ Gr. et Lat. textum recognovit et cum animadversionibus Th. Chr. Harlessii, Jo. Chr. Dan. Schreberi aliorum excerptis suisque edidit Theophilus KIESSLING. Accedunt argumenta Græca, scholia, epistola Jac. Morellii ad Harlessium et indices. 8vo. Lips. 1819.

This edition of Theocritus was to have been edited under the superintendence of Prof. Schæfer; he, however, being fully occupied, deputed the present editor to the task, who, after some hesitation on considering whose place he supplied, consented to engage in it.

After making some observations on the inutility of *merely* reprinting Harless's edition without any attention to what future scholarship had done for the poet, the editor proceeds to state that “Textum, quem vocant, hæc repetita editio habet eum, quem ad certas verasque artis criticæ leges castigatum dedit Valckenærius, ita tamen, ut non neglecta fuerint, quæ alii post Valckenærium viri critico acumine literarumque Græcarum accurata scientia insignes, Ahlwardtus, Beckius, Brunckius, Eichstadtus, Gaisfordius, Græfius, Heinrichius, Hermannus, Jacobsius, Schæferus, alii, sive codicum ducti auctoritate, sive argumentis ex sola linguæ Græcæ indole repetitis, in poetæ scriptura mutanda et novanda existimarunt.” The “argumenta Latina” are reprinted, with a few alterations, “ex editione Gothana, ann. 1808.” The “Scholia” are taken from Warton's editions. The notes are under the text. The Epistle of Morell treats “de Codd. Mss. Theocriti in Biblioth. Reg. Venet. asservatis,” and “de Theocriti loco ab H. Aleandro Jun. in Dissertatione inedita illustrato, deque scriptis nonnullis Aleandri nondum editis.”

In one Volume Octavo, *A Grammar of the Sunscrit Language, on a new plan.* By the Rev. W. YARRES.

The design of this Work is to facilitate the study of the Sunscrit Language, by rendering the Grammar of it more concise and simple.

To expatiate on the excellencies of this language, or to enumerate all the advantages which may be derived from it, is not necessary in a Prospectus. It is universally acknowledged, by those who have made the acquirement of it an object of pursuit, that it stands unrivalled for its harmony and cogency. Its being the

source of so great a number of words in several other Eastern languages, and its containing all the principal Works of the Hindoos on Religion, Philosophy, History, Jurisprudence, &c., give it a decisive claim upon public attention ; and the growing anxiety felt by a considerable part of the literary world to gain an acquaintance with it, notwithstanding the difficulties with which it has been encumbered, sufficiently shows, that it is not devoid of interest or utility.

The learned Sanscrit Grammars formerly published, however excellent in many respects, are confessedly too voluminous, and in many points too abstruse ;—hence many Europeans, after cursorily inspecting them, have concluded either that they should not have time and patience sufficient for the acquirement of a language so complex, or that it was altogether unattainable by them ; and thus have relinquished the study of it in despair.

Sur la Statue Antique de Vénus-Victrix, découverte dans l'isle de Milo en 1820, et sur la Statue Antique connue sous le nom de Germanicus ; par M. de CLARAC, Conservateur du Musée de Paris. Paris, 1821. 4to.

Achillis Tatii de Leucippes et Clitophontis Amoribus Libri VIII. ; Textum ad Mst. fidem recensuit, Latinam Versionem Crucei, notas selectas Salmasii, ineditas Guetii, Gœttingii, Hasii et suas adjecit FRID. JACOBS. Lipsiæ, 1821.

De Choro Græcorum tragico, Dissertatio quam pro summis in Litteris honoribus capessendis scripsit Auctor J. L. VAUCHER. Genève, 1721. 8vo.

ΘΕΩΝΟΣ, &c. —Commentaire de Théon sur les deux livres de la Composition Mathématique de Ptolémée ; traduit par M. HALMA, &c. 2 Vols. 4to. Paris, 1821.

ΑΡΑΤΟΥ, &c. —Les Phénomènes d'Aratus et de Germanicus, avec les Scholies de Théon, les Catastérismes d'Ératosthène, et la Sphère de Léontius, traduits par M. HALMA. 4to. Paris, 1821.

IN THE PRESS.

The Songs of Anacreon, of Teos, are in the press ; translated into English measure, by LORD THURLOW.

The Rev. SAMUEL BURDER, M. A. has far advanced in the press a new work, entitled *Oriental Literature*, applied to the illustration of the Sacred Scriptures, designed as a sequel to *Oriental Customs* : in two large volumes, 8vo., closely and handsomely printed. It will, besides a great body of interesting matter, selected from the most important modern publications, contain much

valuable criticism from a work of Dr. Rosenmüller, of Leipsic, lately published in German, and now first translated into English. At the same time will be published a new edition, being the sixth, of the *Oriental Customs*, in 2 vols. 8vo., greatly augmented from the same sources. Both these works will appear the first week in May.

Mr. VALPY is reprinting his edition of *Brotier's Tacitus* in 4 Vols. Octavo. It combines the advantages of the Paris and Edinburgh Editions, with a selection of Notes from all the Commentators on TACITUS, subsequent to the Edinburgh Edition: the *Literaria Notitia* and *Politica*, with all the Supplements, are also added; the French passages are translated, and the Roman Money turned, into English.

PREPARING FOR THE PRESS.

Mr. T. TAYLOR has translated the eleven books of the *Metamorphosis of Apuleius*, and also his treatise *De Deo Socratis*, and his three books *De Habitudine Doctrinarum Platonis*.

And from the Greek, the Political Pythagoric Fragments preserved by Stobæus: all which will speedily be published.

An Examination of the Primary Argument of the Iliad; by GRANVILLE PENN. Oct. 12s. We shall hope to give some notice of this work.

Mr. LANDSEER is engaged on a learned historical work connected with ancient Oriental History, which will at once interest theologians and antiquaries.

A critical Inquiry into the *Text of the five Books of Moses* will shortly be offered to the public, containing a research into the parallel rites and ceremonies which existed among the Arabs before the days of Mōhammed, the Egyptians, Persians, and Indians, with traces of many of them still existing in the Greek writers. In this work the religion of the early Patriarchs will be examined, and the systems of Astruc, Michaëlis, Jahn, Eickhom, and Bertholdt, will be partially exhibited, and a vast body of matter, illustrative of these institutions, will be produced from Oriental Manuscripts, by D. G. WAIT, LL. B., of St. John's Coll. Camb.

Colonel FRANCKLIN, the ingenious author of several well-known works, a *Tour in Persia*, the *History of Shahaulum*, *Observations on the Plains of Troy*, on the Site of Ancient Palibothra, &c. has announced to a correspondent in England, that he has nearly prepared for the press an Essay on the *Religion of the Jeynes and Boodhists of India*—on serpent worship, idolatrous temples and caverns; subjects which his long residence in various parts

of Asia have in an eminent degree qualified him for investigating with success.

The editor of the Philosophical Magazine and Journal (Alex. Tilloch, LL.D.) is preparing for publication a work which is likely to engage the attention of Biblical students, namely, *Dissertations Introductory to the Study and Right Understanding of the Language, Structure, and Contents of the Apocalypse*. The dissertations are seven in number, viz. first and second on the opinions delivered by ecclesiastical writers respecting the date of the Apocalypse, presenting convincing evidence that this book was the first written of those which compose the New Testament: third, on the language and structure of the Apocalypse: fourth, on various names by which the Creator of the universe is designated in the Scriptures, and the proper mode of translating them: fifth, of the Hebrew name JEHOVAH and the Greek expression *Kyrios the Theos*: sixth, on certain combinations of those terms with other names of personal description which are found in the New Testament: seventh, on certain combinations of nouns of personal description which are found in the Apocalypse.

NOTES TO CORRESPONDENTS.

J. W. will perceive that his turn is only now arriving.

J. W.'s Remarks on Livy came too late for our present No.

R. R. M.'s favors have been received.

Gulchin shall appear in our next, and we shall be always ready to insert his articles.

We thank G. N. for his article, but as we presume the controversy is ended, we do not wish to re-agitate the question.

We hope to be able to give S. the quantity in our next, which he proposes to fill.

The Dublin Prize Essay will certainly appear in the next No.

We shall not forget Mr. W.'s Horace. The Verses are just received.

THE PAMPHLETEER, No. XXXIX.

JUST PUBLISHED, Pr. 6s. 6d.

- ELECTORS' REMEMBRANCER**, or a **GUIDE** to the **VOTES** of each **MEMBER** of the **HOUSE OF COMMONS**, IN THE **PRESENT PARLIAMENT**. Giving an account of the particular conduct of each Member; with general Observations, &c. &c. A similar work has been published in France, and has been found of great utility.
- II.** The **Exposé** of the Present Administration, in a Pamphlet intitled **THE STATE OF THE NATION** in 1822. Under the Four Departments—Finance, Foreign Relations, Home Department, Colonies, &c.
- III.** Mr. **MAINWARING's** Pamphlet on the present State of the Police.
- IV.** A Defence of **Vegetable Regimen**, showing that we were not born to eat Animal Food, &c.
- V.** Mr. **HEATHFIELD's** Observations on the Debt, Agriculture, Trade, &c.
- VI.** Sir **H. PARNELL's** History of the Penal Laws against the Catholics to the Union. (*Now out of print.*)
- VII.** On the Controversy between Lord **BYRON** and Mr. **BOWLES**, relative to **POPE** and Poetry.

ALL THE ABOVE are printed in the **PAMPHLETEER**, No. XXXIX. which is published Quarterly, and records the best Pamphlets of the day at about 6d. each.—The work is particular adapted for **CLASSES**, **SOCIETIES**, and **INSTITUTIONS**.

Sold by Longman and Co.; Sherwood and Co.; Simpkin and Co.; Black, Parbury, Allen, and Co.; W. Carpenter and all other Booksellers, by a general order—where may be had sets in bds. or in numbers.

THE GREEK TESTAMENT,

CONTAINING

Copious Notes from Hardy in particular, Raphel, Kypke, Schleusner, Rosenmuller, Palaiet, &c. in familiar Latin :
Together with parallel passages from the Classics, and with references to Vigerus for Idioms, and Bos for Ellipses.
Griesbach's Various Readings are generally recorded in the Notes.
By **THE REV. E. VALPY, B. D.**

Chaplain to the Bishop of Norwich.

3 vols. 8vo. 2l. 12s. 6d. large paper, 4l. boards.

This Work is intended for the use of Students in Divinity, as well as the Library.

A learned Prelate on the Bench has stated that every passage in this Edition is edited and explained exactly as he himself should have done.

ALSO,
THE GREEK SEPTUAGINT,
 WITH THE APOCRYPHA ;

FROM THE OXFORD EDITION OF BOS AND HOLMES.

1l. 8s. boards.

This Edition is hot-pressed, and handsomely printed in one Volume 8vo. for use in Churches and Chapels, as well as the Library.

* * The *Septuagint* and *Testament* may be had, uniformly bound in four handsome volumes.

Sold by LONGMAN and Co. ; and all other Booksellers.

SCHOOLMASTERS' CATALOGUE.

This day was published *gratis*,

A CATALOGUE OF SCHOOL BOOKS AND GREEK AND LATIN CLASSICS AND TRANSLATIONS ; newly arranged, with an advantageous Proposition to Masters of Grammar and other Schools, who purchase in large quantities.

London : Printed for Lackington, Hughes, Harding, Mavor, and Lepard, Finsbury Square.

This day is published, in two vols. 8vo. price 21s. boards, the
 SECOND EDITION, corrected, of

GYMNASIUM sive SYMBOLA CRITICA,

Containing a variety of Syntactical Rules and Critical Observations, accompanied with an Explanation of Synonymous Words, and illustrated by apposite Exercises ; intended to facilitate the attainment of a correct Latin Prose Style.

By the Rev. ALEXANDER CROMBIE, LL. D.

Printed for R. Hunter, *Successor to Mr. Johnson*, No. 72, St. Paul's Churchyard.

Where may be had, by the same Author,

A TREATISE on the ETYMOLOGY and SYNTAX of the
 ENGLISH LANGUAGE. 8vo. Second Edit. 8s. bds.

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL.

N^o. L.
JUNE, 1822.

CLASSICAL BIOGRAPHY.

No. I.

This article is intended as the first of a series on the lives of the great scholars and critics, who were the fathers of modern classical learning, and who, by their gigantic erudition, indefatigable industry, and extraordinary genius, have deserved the gratitude and admiration of posterity. The events of their lives are often interesting, their intercourse with each other is both instructive and entertaining, and the example which their industry, acquirements, and studies may be made to exhibit, is calculated to perform an essential service in stimulating the ardor of youth, or rousing to exertion the languid efforts of modern scholars. The principal facts of the lives of many of these illustrious men are known, or may be found in biographical compilations, but at the same time so loaded with insipid reflections, so entangled with error, or so feebly narrated, that the effects which might be produced, are in a great measure lost. It is here intended to weave such circumstances as are generally recorded, in a more interesting form, and to resort to the materials, which they have themselves, or at least nearly all of them, left us in their Epistles and other works, for a vast number of new particulars, characteristic as well of the writers, as of the times in which they lived, and of the state of that literature which they spent their lives in studying, advancing, illustrating, and extending over the world, and transmitting to future ages. Should this series be so completed, besides the value of each separate life, they will have the additional value as a whole, of presenting the history of classical literature and literature during one of its most singular and important periods. Chance, rather than design, has directed us to Budæus as our first subject, who, however, as one of the best and earliest Greek scholars of France, has claims even in a chronological point of view.

THE LIFE OF BUDÆUS.

WILLIAM BUDÆUS, or **BUDE**, was born at Paris in 1467, and sprung from an ancient and considerable family. His father was John Budè, Lord of Ierne, of Villers and Marly, who sent his son, first to the schools to learn Latin, and afterwards to the University of Orleans, to study the civil

law. Whether through inattention on the part of the scholar, or negligence on that of the master, young Budæus arrived at Orleans ignorant of the Latin language, and consequently unable to keep pace with his fellow-students in law. Disgusted with his slow progress, he seems to have given up that study in despair, of which he afterwards became a complete master and a distinguished ornament: a lesson which, we believe, if rightly applied, may be found to contain no little instruction; for his failure, like that of many other men in many other studies, was not the fault of dullness, but the want of due preparation. After three years spent in idleness, we are not to be surprised, if the habits of his university life were transferred to his father's house, where he spent his time in pursuing the sports of the field, and abandoned himself to the frivolous pleasures which the passions of ignorant youth suggest, and can alone enjoy. The mind of Budæus however was not one of a nature to find its home, and rest contented, in habits so unintellectual: whether weariness or disgust dictated to him a formal renunciation of them, or whether, as he himself says, his father's example directed him to the source of all his future pleasures and pains, the end and aim of all his after life, certain it is, he suddenly, at the age of twenty-five, acquired a fondness for reading. Into his new pursuit he carried nothing except the ardor and energy, which had distinguished him even in his former years; but to such a degree did he carry his devotion to his new passion, that he forsook every kind of recreation, and actually envied the time bestowed on all the necessary duties and occupations of life, and refused to attend to the warnings of his father, who declared that his excessive application would be the ruin of health, and finally the cause of a premature death.

(Aged twenty-five) In a letter to Erasmus, I. 11, Budæus says, 'Ego jam annos quinque et viginti bona fide servio studio literarum;' the answer to this letter is dated 1516. A. D. and appears to have been written a short time after the other. Budæus was born in 1467. consequently commenced his studies when about twenty-four or five. In this same letter he calls himself *ὑψιμαθῆ τε καὶ αὐτομαθῆτον ὡς ἔτυχε πεπαιδευμένον*.

At this period, learning and learned men appear to have been scarce, more especially the knowledge of the Greek language. Consequently the ardor of Budæus, in the want of a guide to direct it, was for some time mispent on the inferior writers with the glosses and commen-

taries, fashionable in the age just emerging from barbarism; and when he discovered his error, and became desirous to read the ancient authors of Greece, no one was to be found in France capable of teaching him the language, except one Hermonymus, a modern Greek, who happened to be at that time at Paris. This old man, hearing of the love of study which had seized the young and wealthy Budæus, immediately offered his services, which were engaged at a high rate. The accomplishments of the Greek were, however, soon found very limited, for he had undertaken to teach that which he himself did not understand. Budæus at first thought that his ignorance was affected, and that he refused to unlock the treasures of the books he exhibited, and of the authors whose fame he magnified, merely as a means of enhancing their price, and of exacting an additional salary. The scholar, however, was soon obliged to submit to the melancholy conviction, that his master understood only that part of his author which happened to be common to the modern Greek and the ancient Hellenic; and though he could read and pronounce the writings of Homer, this was all the instruction that Budæus was likely to derive from him; so that after regaling his ears with the majestic euphony of the "queen of tongues," and being subjected to a more tantalising trial of patience than happened even to Pyramus and Thisbe of yore, the ignorant and imposing Greek, with five hundred pieces of gold (such was the price of instruction in those times), was dismissed, and his pupil again left to his solitary studies. No other instruction did he ever receive in this or any other language, except a few lessons from the celebrated Joannes Lascaris, who arrived at Paris after Budæus had become almost a proficient in the knowledge of Greek. Thus without external assistance, aided alone by his vigorous perseverance, Budæus attained to such a depth of erudition and skill in both the ancient languages, as not only to leave his Commentaries, and other works, monuments of his genius, but likewise to read and converse in Greek and Latin with the ease and fluency of his vernacular idiom. Such indeed was his familiarity with these tongues, that it is recorded he would frequently read off a Greek book in Latin, and vice versa, a Latin book in Greek. His Greek letters still remain a proof of his intimacy with that language, and more particularly his Latin and Greek letters, in which he falls unconsciously from one lan-

guage to the other, according as it struck him either was most adapted to the expression of the sentiments which he was about to convey to his correspondent.

It is not to be supposed that these accomplishments were procured at an easy rate, but were indeed purchased at the expense of his whole time, and eventually with the loss of his health, during the space of twenty years. Scattered up and down his writings, we find repeated declarations of his not diverting a moment from his studies, and not allowing himself the slightest holiday; he somewhere even regrets that he could only procure six hours of reading on the day of his marriage; and a courtier, who lived in a house opposite to that of Budæus, told Francis I. that for ten years he had had an opportunity of observing the manners of this scholar, and had never seen him for the whole of that time, either on feast-day, sabbath or holiday, standing at his door, taking exercise in the morning, or gazing out of his window at the passengers in the street, after the manner of other Parisians. The King turned with an enquiring look to Budæus, who said, "Certainly this is all true, and much more, which if I were to recount, I should perhaps hardly be believed."¹ In a letter to Tonstall, he describes himself as resisting the enticements of his wife, the blandishments of his children, the importunate calls of his circumstances, and the threatening interdictions of his physicians, the united force of all which could not drag him from his *Philologia*, the wife of his mind, the object of his purest affections.²

His excessive application at length brought on its never-failing consequence, the total ruin of his health. In one of his letters to Erasmus, (about 1519) he says of himself, that he often sleeps in the morning, for that during the last fourteen years he does not recollect spending three nights free from an acute head-ache to which he had become subject. Louis le Roy, who has left a Latin memoir of Budæus, written immediately after his decease, draws a melancholy picture of his sufferings, and the emaciated state to which they had reduced him:

"Postremo res eo rediit, dum literarum magis studiosus quam lucis cupidus esse pergit, dum hoc sublato bono vitam nihili putat, in gravem et diuturnum morbum est prolapsus, quo annos plus viginti ita afflictatus

est, ut omnis prope hilaritas e fronte, alacritas ex animo, festivitas in occurso, urbanitas et comitas in convictu eximeretur, ingravescent quoque indies literarum amor infringeretur, ne vestigium quidem ejus, nec simulacrum sed *quædam effigies spirantis mortui* apparet. Morbus erat ejusmodi, ingens dolor cum tumore circum fauces fiebat, et jugulum tumultuose appetens tantum terrorem interdum noctu injiciebat, ut postridie mane miraretur se incolumem, spiritum recordatus interclusum, et subinde restitutum; uxor edocta, advenientem morbum et crescentem intelligens, virum varie versando, humerosque feriendo levabat dolorem. Verum inde pallor multus in vultu, raritas pilorum in capite, macies et stupor in corpore, in omnibusque artubus debilitas summa sequebatur. Quæ cum medicis persæpe narraret, fidem tanti mali facere non poterat, cujus ipsi exemplum non meminissent: idque alternis prope mensibus recurrebat. Accedebat ad hæc quotidiana capitis gravedo: quæ illi commentanti aut legenti quidpiam erat mirum in modum infesta."

This disorder the physicians of that age fancied arose from humors which pressed upon the brain, hence in their wisdom they opined, that if they could only make a hole in the head of the afflicted scholar, an outlet would be afforded, through which these humors would evaporate. Budæus submitted; the experiment, extraordinary as it may seem, was actually tried, to the great torture of the patient; and a hole was burnt, with red hot iron, through a particular part of the thick skin which clothes the skull. It is needless to say, no relief was found from a device so cruel and absurd. During this long and severe illness, he acknowledged the importance of regular exercise, and occasional relaxation. He began to spend a great part of his time in active employments, in gardening, planting, drawing water, cleaving wood, and other rural occupations, which, together with attention to his diet, and that temperance for which he was always remarkable, completely restored him to robust health: so that it is most gratifying to find that the latter part of his life was free from sickness, and that he then indeed enjoyed a higher degree of health and strength, to a good old age (73 years), than in the prime of manhood.

It is remarkable that nearly all the works which Budæus wrote, were written and published during the years in which he was visited with this malady. For such was the stern and unrelenting nature of his perseverance, that even sickness could not divert him from his favorite studies. At the same time his publications, though works of immense industry and talent, may perhaps be considered rather as the fruits of his former application, and the writing of them the exercise only of his acquirements, and proba-

bly an occupation of much less fatigue than the acquisition of his learning, in those days when a scholar, with very few books, and no methods of instruction, was left to pioneer his own way. The first work, on which Budæus tried his strength, was a translation of some pieces attributed to Plutarch. His version of the “*de placitis philosophorum*” first appeared, the epistle dedicatory of which to Germanus Ganeius, is dated 1502, when Budæus was thirty-five years of age; he appears to have undertaken it by accident, and certainly his reading did not look to publication as an end, but rather to the satisfaction of an ardent passion, and the reward of a high estimation among his countrymen for learning, which was at the time sufficiently rare. This piece was followed by other translations, from the same author, in the succeeding years 1503 and 1505. But he was in the mean time meditating and preparing a work, which he published in 1508, entitled *Annotationes in Pandectas*, a most learned, acute and laborious series of emendation, and illustration of the digests of the civil law. After these in 1514, he completed his five books *de Asse, divinum opus*; and in 1529, his *Commentarii Linguae Græcæ*, two works of which more will be said in a subsequent part of this paper.

When learning and learned men were so rare as they were when Budæus commenced his career, it is not to be supposed that he, the *portentum Galliæ*, as Erasmus called him, was viewed with indifference—so far indeed was this from being the case, that his fame seems to have been the pride and boast of all the literary Frenchmen of his time, who, when he grew older, considered him as the patriarch of literature, and the glory and protection of its professors. His fame seems early to have reached the court, whither he was invited by Charles the VIIIth a short time before that monarch's death in 1498. Lewis XII. employed him in two embassies to Italy, and he was a particular favorite with his successor Francis I., who delighted to listen to his conversation. He appointed Budæus his librarian, and invested him with the most honorable office of *Maître des requêtes*, while at the same time the Parisians, willing to emulate their monarch in showing their sense of his merits, elected him “*prévôt des marchands*.” It was in attending on this monarch that this illustrious scholar met his last illness. The excessive heats of 1540 obliged

Francis to retreat to the coasts of Normandy, where Budæus accompanied him, and caught a fever which carried him to his grave. He was brought home to Paris, and had the consolation of dying amidst his numerous family. He died on the 23d of August 1540, leaving behind him seven sons and four daughters.

We will now proceed to glean from the writings of Budæus a few passages and observations, which either illustrate his own life, his works, his intercourse with his friends, or throw light upon the literary history of the times in which he lived. His miscellaneous works and letters are scarce, by no means easy to read, and though, doubtless, very important when they appeared, are now in a great measure superseded. So that our extracts will at least have the merit of presenting to the reader that which he is not likely to meet with in any other form.

Of the change which we have mentioned as taking place in his habits, and indeed in the whole course of his early education and studies, he himself gives a very interesting account in a letter to Cuthbert Tonstall, the celebrated Bishop of Durham, which is to be found among the Epistles of Erasmus. (Ep. 30. lib. 2.)

“Dixeram me αὐτομαθῇ τε καὶ ὀψιμαθῇ fuisse; et non modo præceptore nullo, sed etiam serò literis bonis studuisse: nunc eo amplius dico, literarum me rudimenta et Grammatices principia, ut tum ferebant mores, simplicitates nunc obsoletæ, in hac urbe didicisse triviali sub ludimagistro. Cumque hiscere Latine vix cœpissem, ad juris studium transivisse, aut transiluisse potius, dispendioso temporis compendio. In quo cùm triennii operam luissem, domum reversus salutem dixi literis, studiis utique indulgens juventutis illiteratæ: quoad post aliquot annos intra paternos parietes clam studere mecum ipse institui, procul omnibus conventiculis hujus urbis scholasticorum, excitante me tantum patris exemplo doctrinæ laudatore, et librorum emacissimo. Ibi a deterrimo quoque, ut fit, auctore auspicatus, cum glossematum faciem per imprudentiam hausissem, errore tandem intellecto, cum ad libros meliores me contulissem, paulatim redundantem illam præcordiis meis faciem rejeci. Ecce autem aliud incommodum, quum, accipitrariis et venatoribus salute semel dicta, annos abhinc sex et viginti, libris, ut dixi, non magistris aliquo cum successu operam dare cœpissem; statim Græcum quendam nactus sum senem, aut ille me potius; illi enim vectigal magnum attu-

li, qui literas Græcas hactenus aut paulo plus noverat, quatenus sermoni literato cum vernaculo convenit. Hic quibus me modis torserit, mox dediscenda docendo, nisi quod et legere optime et bene pronunciare sciebat, non bene tribus chartis scriberem, cum interim ipse ut unum eum esse *Græcum* in Francia audiebam, sic esse doctissimum *Græce* existimarem, et ille ostendens mihi Homerum, nonnullosque auctores famigeratos nuncupans, flagrare me studio insano intelligeret. Accedebat illud erroris, quod quæ erāt in eo ignorantia ego ludificationem esse putabam, quo diutius ille me stipendiarium haberet. Tandem literis apud nostros paucis annis illustratis Italiæ commercio, librisque sensim utriusque linguæ advectis, cum ego sarcire damnum contenderem ætatulæ transactæ per inscitiam : nec pecuniæ in cœmundis magno libris, nec labori in ediscendis parcerem, ac quotidianas sesquioperas a me plane exigere : eo primum perveni, ut dediscere instituerem, quæ male edoctus eram : deinde ut ultra præceptorum illi Græco ne auscultarem, etiamsi ad me ventitabat, libros emturienti venditans ac scriptitans, quanti semel indicasset.***** Jam vero adversam valetudinem non tam mihi agnatam (ut arbitror) quam cognatam et ingenitam, quantum mihi facessisse negotiorum putas ? cum mihi se semper sequaciorem umbra præberet, quocunque agerem terrarum : eo jam ipso molestior, quod ejus crimine, literarum studium, cum a medicis tum ab omnibus mihi obviis, plus jam annos quindecim male audit, ut insanum et exitiabile : literarum eo amplius Græcarum, ut vesanum et piaculo simile, etiam si nuper cœpit esse plausibile. Nec tamen ideo velim ut omnino me expungas e numeris classicorum, ut domestica atque umbratica eruditione institutum : posse enim sic quoque mihi videor inter juniores centuriari, cum inter munifices profiteri cœperim, nec præpropere, nec infelicissime, ut vestrae amborum auctoritati, aliorumque credo. Interim bis Romam adii, urbesque insignes Italiæ, doctos ubi homines per transennam vidi potius quam audiui, et literarum meliorum professores tanquam a limine salutavi : quantum scilicet homini licuit Italiam raptim peragranti, nec libera legatione : sed et domi nonnunquam doctorum hominum familiaritate usus sum. In quibus præcipue colui Joannem Lascarium, virum Græcum utraque lingua pereruditum : qui nunc in Urbe, Græcorum scholæ præfectus est a Pontifice : is quum omnia causa mea cuperet, non magnopere juvare me potuit, quum ageret fero

in comitatu Regis multis ab hac urbe millibus distractus, et ego frequens in urbe, raro in comitatu fuerim, fecit libens id demum quod potuit, ut et nonnunquam præsens mihi aliquid perlegeret; id quod vicies non contigit, et absens librorum scrinia concrederet, et penes me deponeret. Certe tirocinium nullo sub deductore feci. En tibi studiorum meorum curriculum, quod sub patre indulgente facile inchoavi, haud scio quam auspicato. Patre orbatus annos abhinc quindecim, ac multa incommoda perpeusus, fortunæque improbitatem multipliciter expertus, cursum nihilo secius institutum peragere velis remisque contendere, remoram tantum unam molestissimam sensi adversæ valetudinis: ac nihil æque mihi animum illum alacrem in hæc studia incumbentem contraxit ac demisit, quam assidua mortis meditatio in horas imminentes quum sæpe mihi spiritum interclusum, subindeque restitutum meminerim. Patri copiose hæres relictus non ex solida uncia semissem enim maximus fratrum primigeniorum jure tulerat, ac matris hæreditate eandem partem quadriennio posthabui: hoc fere fuit subsidium instituti mihi cursus, cum iis accesserunt, ita ut interim nihil quaquam acceptum tulerim liberalitati, aut Regum, aut fortunæ. In quo cursu patrimonii jacturam multam feci per incuriam, etiamsi naufragium evasi."

PROFESSOR DUNBAR'S Defence¹ of his
ANALECTA GRÆCA MAJORA.

Ἀνδρῶν γὰρ σωφρόνων μὲν ἔστιν, εἰ μὴ ἀδίκουσιντο, ἡσυχάζειν, ἀγαθῶν δὲ, ἀδικουμένων, ἐξ εἰρήνης πολεμεῖν. Thucyd.

I WAS NOT aware, till I perused the last number of the *Classical Journal*, that the Editors of the *Cambridge Classical Researches*, in a number which appears to have occupied them full five years in getting up, had thought it necessary to apprise the public, in consequence of an erroneous assertion in "Peter's Letters to his Kinsfolk," that "I have never been a contributor, small or

¹ We had hoped that the tug of war between our native Greeks had ceased and been forgotten, but we could not of course omit the insertion of this Defence of one of our oldest Correspondents.

great, to their publication." They appear to have considered it prudent and wise, "to contradict most positively the assertion" contained in "the popular and entertaining work" alluded to, lest my name, as the author of a publication which I have called "a continuation of *Dalzel's Collectanea Græca*," should injure the *reputation*, and mar the *sale* of the *Camb. Class. Res.* It was, however, hardly necessary for these gentlemen to contradict the assertion so positively, had their sole aim been to undeceive the world in this respect, as few persons, from the character of the work in which it was contained, would believe the assertion, and scarcely any would bestow a thought on it. Their aim and object was of a different kind, to injure, by a malicious insinuation, the character of the work which I had published. To the reputed Editors of the *Camb. Class. Res.* I owe a debt of no small magnitude, which the want of leisure and a fit opportunity have hitherto prevented me from acknowledging; but which, since they have again laid me under a fresh obligation, I shall now endeavor, in some measure, to repay.

When, in consequence of the advice of several literary friends, I undertook to prepare for publication the 3d vol. of the *Analecta Gr. Maj.*, I was naturally led to follow the footsteps of my predecessor, and to insert quotations from different commentators and editors, calculated to explain difficulties, and illustrate the text. In the simplicity of my heart I imagined that, to make occasional observations on the opinions or doctrines of others when they appeared to me erroneous, was serving the cause of literature, and that, when I assigned to every man his own, I neither robbed him of his property nor injured his reputation. That such would have been the feeling of some scholars, had I borrowed any thing from them, I am well assured. That such has been the feeling of the most liberal and enlightened in all ages, except where rivalry and petty jealousy broke out, is evident from their works. But there are some men so arrogant in their pretensions, so conceited in their notions of their own merits and abilities, and so flattered by their dependents and admirers, that they look with scorn and contempt on all others without the pale of their friendship, and deem it high presumption when their dogmas are called in question. Some such feelings and qualities as these appear to have given origin to the hostility I have experienced from Dr. Blomfield and Mr. Monk; an hostility not shown in open and honorable warfare, but in the mean and pitiful endeavor to injure my character as a scholar, and to stop the sale of my work. I had observed, when examining Blomfield's notes and glossary on the *Prometheus*

Vinctus and Septem adv. Thebas of Æschylus, and the annotations of Monk on the Alcestis of Euripides, several statements that I considered incorrect; I therefore thought it my duty to point out, with candor and fairness, the errors into which they had fallen. When the work was finished, I sent copies to both of them, with a letter to each, requesting their acceptance of the vol., and begging their indulgence for the extracts I had made from their notes. The receipt of the volumes was never acknowledged; the letters were never answered. Standing, as I thought, on as high ground as either Dr. Blomfield or Mr. Monk, I naturally expected that some communication would have been made to me, if not on the score of kindness and good-will, at least on that of common civility. But I soon found myself egregiously mistaken. The latter gentleman, I was informed, with all that modesty, charity and kindly feeling towards contemporary scholars, for which he is so eminently distinguished, immediately urged his publisher in London to prosecute for an *Injunction* against my work, and characterised it as a production that would disgrace the name of any scholar. Ashamed and mortified that I should have had the folly to lay myself under any obligations to such a man, I resolved at once to cancel all his notes, except a few on which I had animadverted, and to show the world how easily I could free myself from the debt of gratitude to *J. H. Monk*. But, I confess I should have regarded the matter in a different light. I should have considered that those, who have little to spare of their own, are very unwilling to have that little taken from them, and that I was no more to expect the magnanimity of Porson in his successor, than Porson's talents and learning.

Though I had thus endeavored to free myself from all obligation to Mr. Monk, and though I imagined that the notes and philological remarks of Dr. Blomfield were as fair objects of criticism as those of Schutz and others on which I had commented, still the threat of an *Injunction* was held over my head for near a twelvemonth, and the sale of the vol. in London almost completely stopt. How far Dr. Blomfield was accessory to this extraordinary proceeding I could only infer from certain letters which I and my publishers received from a house in London, who appear to have been made the medium of communication between us; and who occasionally held out threats, and at other times proposals of accommodation, if *pecuniary* sacrifices should be made. Such a proposal met with the contempt it deserved, and the parties were left to pursue their course with an assurance that every step they should take hostile to the pub-

lication would be opposed to the utmost. Finding, it is likely, that neither honor nor profit could be gained by moving for an *Injunction*, they had recourse to other modes of prevention, and to a number of illiberal and petty insinuations, tending to discredit the work and prevent its circulation. I am far from saying that it is exempt from errors and mistakes. Had I enjoyed the learned ease of some gentlemen, and not been completely occupied during more than one half of the year in superintending the education of nearly 400 students, I might have made it more correct than it is, and might have enriched my notes with some recondite learning, even though it had been obtained at second-hand, and taken from others without acknowledgment. But this I will venture to say, that there are in the vol. more original observations, be their value what they may, than are to be found in all Dr. Blomfield's notes and glossary on the two plays of *Æschylus*, and in Mr. Monk's annotations on *Alceſtis*. The latter gentleman, indeed, to do him justice, can hardly ever be accused of making excursions without a guide, who, like *Xanthias* in the *Frogs*, is only put foremost when blows may be expected, and is turned to the rear when honor or profit is in the wind.

Perhaps, it may not be amiss to examine, somewhat closely, the pretensions of both these gentlemen to the high name they appear to have assumed among scholars, and the degree of respect to which their opinions are entitled, in consequence of their literary attainments. A correspondent, Mr. G. Burges, has lately drawn so many feathers from the wing of one of them, that he will hardly be able for a length of time to raise himself from the ground; and the pinions of the other are so feeble, that they soon fail him in his attempt to soar above his native element. In that branch of literature which consists in consulting indices, in examining the annotations of commentators and editors, in comparing different readings and amassing authorities, all which depend more upon patient industry than powers of original investigation and philosophical research, they are entitled to praise. But is there any thing in their notes on which one can look back and say, here is a new *canon* or *law* hitherto undiscovered, here are some ingenious speculations respecting the nature and formation of the language, or acute philological disquisitions on the primary use and secondary application of a number of important words? Have they traced, with philosophical accuracy, the laws of thought that led the ancients to many of their most beautiful, figurative expressions, or have they even shown sufficient knowledge of the idioms and

general structure of the Greek tongue? Whatever opinion may be formed of their merits in the beaten track of criticism, their greatest admirers will scarcely have the boldness to affirm that they have in any of these respects advanced the study of the language. That it may not, however, be said that I have made assertions without proofs to support them, I shall take a few examples from Blomfield's notes and glossary on the *Prometheus Vincetus* and the *Agamemnon* of Æschylus, the first and the last of the plays he has edited, reserving a few on the *Hippolytus* and *Alcestis* of Monk till some future opportunity. •

Γέλασμα, which occurs in line 90 of the *Prometheus*, is thus explained in the glossary, "*Risus. Lenis fluctuum agitatio, quæ ab Homero φρεῖξ vocatur.*" One would have thought that the very sound of these words, independent of their derivation, would have prevented any lexicographer from joining them together as explanatory of the same object. The *ἀνήριθμον γέλασμα* of Æschylus is "the countless rippling of the sea sparkling under the beams of the unclouded sun." The *φρεῖξ* of Homer is "the dark curling of the waves when first agitated by an approaching storm." Thus *Il. η'. 63 64. οἷη Ζεφύροιο νέον ὄρνιμέ- νου φρεῖξ ἐχέυατο ἐπὶ πόντον, μελάνει δέ τε πόντος ὑπ' αὐτῆς. φ'. 126. θρώσκων τις κατὰ κύμα μέλαιναν φρεῖχ' ὑπαλύξει ἰχθύς.* Now if any one will say that the *ἀνήριθμον γέλασμα* of Æschylus, and the *μέλαινα φρεῖξ* of Homer indicate the same state of the sea, or would present the same aspect to a spectator, I can only say that he may have a talent for hunting after authorities, but that he shows little discrimination in the use of them.

In v. 112, the word *ἀπλάκημάτων* occurs. It is thus explained in the Glossary. "*Ἀπλάκημα. Error. Culpa. Videtur formatum esse a πλάζω, errare facio, a præfixo πλεοναστικῶς, vel κατ' ἐπιτάσιν; ut στάχυς, ἄσταχυς. βληχρὸς, ἀβληχρὸς; μέλγω, ἀμέλγω; et similia.*" Now, the word is not formed from *πλάζω, errare facio*, because all compounds, formed from verbs whose active and middle voice differ in their signification, take the meaning of the *middle*, not the *active* voice. Thus, *ἄπειθος, disobedient*, from *πειθωμαι, obedio*. *ἄγευστος, without tasting*, from *γεύωμαι, gusto*. *ἄαπτος, not to be touched*, from *ἅπτομαι, tango*. *ἀφραδία, from φράζωμαι, delibero*. Æschylus has *θαλασσοπλάγκτα—ὀχήματα, vessels traversing the seas*, from *θάλασσα*, and the perfect passive of *πλάζω*. If *ἀπλάκημα* had been formed immediately from this verb, it would, in all probability, have been from the perfect passive, like the compound above. It is quite evident, however, that it takes its origin from a different verb, viz. *ἀμπλακίω, aberro*: or, as Blomfield and Monk would

have it, ἀπλακέω. The 2d aorist of this verb occurs repeatedly in Euripides. Hippol. v. 896. γνώσει γὰρ αὐθις ἀπλακῶν—Alcestis, 248. Ἀπλακῶν ἀλόχου τῆσδ', ἀβίωτον. Andr. 940. ἡ δ' ἀπλακοῦσα. The kindred noun ἀμπλακία is also found in the same poet. Med. 116. τί δὲ σοὶ παῖδες πατρὸς ἀμπλακίας. Porson's Ed. See Hippol. 1360.—I hope to be able to show, contrary to Blomfield's and Monk's authority, that both the verb and the noun require to be read with the *μ* in every instance where they occur in Iambic verse, as it is a component part of the word, and that it was occasionally dropt in other kinds of verse, for the sake of the metre, as *πίμπλημι* was sometimes written *πίπλημι*. The verb I take to be a compound of *ἀνὰ* and *πλακέω*, formed into *ἀμπλακέω*, and the noun *ἀμπλάκημα* from the perfect passive of the same. In addition to the examples I have produced in my note in the Collect. Maj. vol. III., of *ἀνὰ* being frequently changed into *ἀμ* when compounded with other words, the following may be added: Sophocl. Philoct. 870. *κάμπνόντ' ἔτι*. Eurip. Phœniss. 799. *βόστρυχον ἀμπετάσας*. Æschyl. Pers. 572. *ἀμπεδιήρεις*: on which Blomfield remarks, “Dein ἀναπεδιήρεις Rob. Nescio an alibi apud Tragicos præpositio nomini adhæreat, ut ex iis una fiat vox, quod sæpius apud Homerum factum est.” I shall furnish him with one or two examples, since his reading among the Tragic poets seems so very limited. Eurip. Iphig. in Taur. v. 92. *καὶ ταῦτα δράσαντ' ἀμπνοῶς ἔξιν πόνων*. 97. *πότερα δωμάτων πρὸς ἀμβάσεις*, or, as others read *προσαμβάσεις*. Bacchæ, 1096. *τὸν ἀμβάτην θῆρ' ὡς ἔλωμεν*. Heracl. 271. *κοῦκ ἐς ἀμβολάς*. In a note on v. 336. of the Agamemnon of Æschylus, he says, “Tragicos dixisse ἀπλακεῖν non ἀμπλακεῖν pluribus ostendit Burneius in Menstrua Censura (*Monthly Review*, Feb. 1796, p. 132). Alteram scripturam frustra tuetur Ahlwardtius in Symbol. p. 12. qui ἀπλακεῖν dictum putat pro ἀναπλακεῖν, verbo plane inaudito et contra analogiæ leges formato.” I suppose he will say that *ἀμπετάσας* and *ἀμπνέοντα* are also against the laws of analogy. Let us next consider the situation of the words as they stand in different Iambic verses, and enquire whether the *α*, according to Porson's canon, can be *long* before *πλ*. “Rarius multo syllaba producitur in verbo composito, si in ipsam juncturam cadit.” So far as my observation goes, a short vowel before *πλ*, even though the word is not a compound, almost always remains short in Iambic verse, and always when a compound, unless under a particular law afterwards to be explained. Thus Eurip. Androm. 217. *Ἐκτεινας ἀν τᾶσδ'; εἴτ' ἀπληστίαν λέχους*. Æschyl.

Prom. 109. *Ναρθηκοπλήρωτον*. Eurip. Suppl. 724. αὐτὸς θ' ὄπλισμα. Iphig. in Aul. 88. ἤμεσθ', ἀπλοίᾳ χρώμενοι. Orest.

917. ἡ κεῖν', ἀφήρει, μήθ' ὀπλιζεσθαι χέρα.—If these observations

be correct, the reading in v. 112. of the *Prometheus*, τοιάσδε ποινὰς ἀπλακηνμάτων τίνω, gives a *Trochæus* in the third place, instead of a *Spondæus*. The same observation applies to the reading which Monk has adopted in the *Hippolytus* v. 896. γνώσει γὰρ αὐθις ἀπλακῶν where the third foot is a *Pyrrichius*.

Androm. 940. ἡ δ' ἀπλακοῦσα. Unless, therefore, the Pleonas-

tic α can be proved to be naturally long, the μ ought to be inserted before the πλ in all these examples, both in consequence of the derivation, and for the sake of the verse.

There is only another method, which, if the derivation could be got rid of, would account for the lengthening of the α before πλ, and which, as I hold it to be a principle recognised by the Attic poets as well as Homer, though in a much more limited degree, deserves far more consideration than has hitherto been bestowed on it. Early prejudices and attachment to names and systems will, I have no doubt, prevent veterans in literature from adopting it; but I have better expectations from those entering on their career, and who have the courage to think for themselves.

The canon which Dawes long ago established, that, 'in Iambic verse, the ictus falls on the *last* syllable of an *Iambus*, *Spondæus* and *Anapæstus*,' has never been recognised farther than as it applied to the *long* syllable of an *Iambus*. Numerous examples, however, occur in the Attic poets, to show that it is applicable also to a syllable, naturally short, which, being the last of an *Iambus*, becomes long in consequence of the ictus on it, or, in other words, in consequence of the *increased time*, which the harmony of the verse naturally requires should be given it when it occupies that situation. It has been observed by several writers on Prosody, that a short vowel in Iambic verse sometimes requires to be pronounced as a long vowel before the inceptive ρ, as the difficulty of pronouncing that letter occasioned the lengthening of the vowel. But examples occur in which the inceptive ρ is found to have no such power, when the short vowel precedes it in the first syllable of the foot. There must then be some other cause, independent of the letter ρ, to lengthen a short syl-

lable when it forms the second syllable of an Iambus, and that can be no other than the *ictus metricus* on that syllable, thus:

σὺ δ' οὐκ ἀνέξει; χρῆν σ' ἐπὶ ῥητοῖς ἄρα. Eurip. Suppl. 461.

τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἥδη τούργον· εἰς ἐμὲ ῥέπον. Soph. Œdip. Tyr. 847.

οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅπως ὁ χρησμὸς εἰς τοῦτ' ὀρέπει. Aristoph. Plut. 51.

See also v. 1065. Pax. 740. ἐς τὰ ῥάκια σκώπτοντας αἰί. Æschyl. Prom. 1059.

In the following the short vowel remains short before the inceptive ῥ.

Χρήμπτουσα ῥαχίαισι ἐκπερᾶν χθόνα. Æschyl. Prom. 737.

τὸν μητρὸς, αὐδῶν ἄνοσι· οὐδὲ ῥητά μοι. Soph. Œd. I. 1289.

Upon what other principle but this can we account for the change of quantity of the same syllable in the following line from the *Philoctetes* of Sophocles, v. 297?

Ἄλλ' ἐν πέτροισι πέτρον ἐκτρίβων, μῆλις.

It is well known that the *ν* (ἐφελευστικόν) was often inserted to prevent the hiatus of vowels. Had this principle been understood, it would never have been introduced in the following verse, where there is no hiatus.

Ἀναρχίας γὰρ μείζον οὐκ ἔστι κακόν. Soph. Antig. 672.

Nor the *σ* interposed before *θα* in the first person plural of verbs, nor *ρ* doubled contrary to the orthography of the simple words.

γενησόμεθα, κείς ὁδὸν βεβήκαμεν. Eurip. Med. 764.

ἐκ ταῦδ' ἀναβόμεθα πρυμνήτην κάλων. Id. 768.

πείσειν δυνησόμεθα μηδὲν ὦν λέγω. Sophocle. Philoct. 137.

In the following compound, the *ρ* is not doubled. Soph. Aj. 134. Τελαμώνιε παῖ, τῆς ἀμφιρύτου. Why then should it be dou-

bled in this verse, Ἀκτὴ μὲν ἦδε τῆς περιβρύτου χθονός. Soph. Philoct. v. 1, where the *ι* is the second syllable of the Iambic foot? On the same principle is the last syllable of the accusative *Θησιᾶ*, *Ὀρφέα*, *βασιλεία*, and others lengthened, not, as has been generally stated, because they follow the analogy of the genitives in *έως*, than which nothing can be more absurd, because there are several instances where the *α* of such accusatives retains its natural quantity.

Ἐν ταῖσδε τὸν ἐμὸν φονέα τιμωρήσομαι. Eurip. Hecub. 870.

λέξον, τί δρῶν ἂν φονέα τισαίμην πατρός. Id. v. 599.

See also Soph. *Œd.* Col. 1055.

In the following examples the *α* has the ictus:

καὶ μετεκάλει τὸν ἰσρέα· νῦν δ' οὐδὲ εἰς. Aristoph. *Plut.* 1182.

ποῖ γῆς ἀνακτα τῆσδε Θησέα μολών; Eurip. *Hippol.* 1148.

τὸν οὐκ ἔτ' ὄντα ζῶντ' Ἀχιλλεα πάλιν. Soph. *Philoct.* 361.

Let us now consider how this principle will apply to the point at issue. Porson has remarked on v. 64. of the *Orestes* of Euripides, that the short vowel of a preposition when joined to a verb, beginning with a mute and a liquid, is rarely lengthened. The example which he gives of ἀποτρόποι, *Phoeniss.* 595. depends upon this principle. ὦ θεοί, γένοισθε τῶν δ' ἀπότροποι κακῶν. As in the verb ἀποτρέπει, *Orest.* 404. the *ο* is short. σεμναὶ γάρ· εὐπαίδευτα δ' ἀποτρέπει λέγειν. The following are also to the same effect:

ταῦτ' αὖθ' ἕκαστα, μῆτερ, οὐχὶ περιπλοκάς. *Phoeniss.* 404.

καὶ γαῖ' ἐν ἧ χρῆ δώματ' ἀναπληρουμένους. *Helen.* 916.

In line 432. of the *Hecuba*, the *ε* of πέπλοις is short, Κόμιζ', Ὀδυσσεῦ, μ', ἀμφιθεῖς κάρα πέπλοις. So also in 246. 485. In line 999. it is long as being the second syllable of the foot. Ποῦ δῆτα; πέπλων ἐντὸς ἧ κρύβασ' ἔχεις. So also in the *Helena* of the same poet, v. 1185. Αὐτῇ, τί πέπλους μέλινας ἐξήψω χροός.

In the following lines the difference in quantity of a short vowel before a mute and liquid in the same word, when it is in the first syllable and when in the second of the foot, must unquestionably depend upon this principle:

τά θ' ὅπλ' ἀπῆτουν τοῦ πατρὸς, τά τ' ἄλλ' ὅθ' ἦν. Soph. *Phil.* 365.

πάτρῳ' ἔλκεσθαι τῶν δ' ὅπλων κείνων ἀνὴρ. 368. See also 379.

Πάτροκλος, ὅς σου πατὴρ ἦν τὰ φίλτατα. Id. 436.

κείνοις Ἀτρεΐδαις. 322. ἔγκλημ' Ἀτρεΐδαις. See also 364. 315,

&c.

λόγος λ' λεκται πᾶς· Ὀδ' Ἀτρεΐδας στυγῶν. 392, and 906.

In the *Prometh.* *Vinctus* of Æschylus, the *ι* of *ιατρὸς* is long as having the ictus: ὄργῃς νοσοῦσης εἰσὶν ιατροὶ λόγοι. In the *Supplices* of Euripides, v. 264. it is short: ἀλλ' ὡς ιατρὸν τῶν δ'—
See also *Troad.* 1224. *Hippol.* 296. But in *Ion.* v. 740. it is long as having the ictus: συνεκπανοῦτα κῶλον ιατρὸς γενοῖ. The *ε* of *ἔδρας* in the *Prometh.* v. 397. is short; the same vowel in *Ξυνεδρίαί* is long. 501. Thus ἦ τῷ νέον θακοῦντι παγκρατεῖς ἔδρας.—
*ἔ*χθραι τε καὶ στέργῃθρα καὶ ξυνεδρίαι. *Soph. Œd. Tyr.* 2. τίνας ποθ' ἔδρας τάσδε. *Prometh.* 1002. τῆς σῆς λατρειας. v. 1004. κρεῖσσον γὰρ οἶμαι τῇδε λατρευειν πέτρα.

It is remarkable that the *Α* in Ἀρης should undergo the same change of quantity as in Epic poetry, (See *Prosodia Græca*, P. II. p. 44.) Thus Æschyl. S. c. Th. 230. τοῦτω γὰρ Ἀρης βόσκεται φόβω βροτῶν. See also v. 465. But in v. 408. Σπαρτῶν δ' ἀπ' ἀνδρῶν, ἂν Ἀρης ἐφείσατο. The *Α* is also short in v. 493.; also short in *Eurip. Phœniss.* 1417. Professor Porson in a note on v. 1164. of the *Hecuba* of Euripides remarks, “*ἀεὶ* Stobæus. Recte hujus vocis penultimam communem esse statuit Piersonus ad Mœrin, p. 231.” The *α*, however, is common in no other way than other short vowels, which are lengthened when they occupy a certain situation in the verse, thus: τοῖονδ' ὁ δ' ἀεὶ ξυντυχῶν ἐπίσταται. *Hecuba*, 1164. καγώ μεν ἀεὶ βασιλέων θυμουμένων. *Med.* 456. In verse 458, Porson's *Ed.* it is short as in many other places: σὺ δ' οὐκ ἀνίεις μωρίας, λέγουσ' ἀεί.

The noun τέκνα in the first line of the *Œdip. Tyr.* of Sophocles has the *ε* long; in v. 6. short, thus: ὦ τέκνα, Κάδμου—ἀγῶ δικαιῶν μὴ παρ' ἀγγέλων, τέκνα. See *Sophocl. Philoct.* 486. 502. *Eurip. Med.* 788. 801, &c. The *α* in μακρὸς is varied in the same manner: *Soph. Phil.* 307. ἐν τῷ μακρῷ γενοιτ'. v. 492. κακειθεν οὐ μοι μακρὸς εἰς Οἶτην στόλος. In the *Hecuba* of

Eurip. the *ε* in νεκρός is long; v. 671. ἀτὰρ τί νεκρὸν τόνδε μισί
Πολυξένης. See also Alcest. v. 732. In 393 it is short: γαῖα
νεκρῷ τε τῷ. See also Alcest. 434.

The same principle may be recognised in the Iambic verse of the comic poets: and there can hardly be a stronger proof of its validity than in the following line from the Plutus of Aristophanes, expressive of the eager scent of the sycophant:

ὦ ὦ, ὦ ὦ, ὦ ὦ, ὦ ὦ, ὦ ὦ, ὦ ὦ, ὦ ὦ. v. 895.

From these and innumerable other examples which could be produced, I imagine the three following rules may be established: I. In all compound words, a short vowel, terminating the first part of the compound, before a mute and a liquid, remains short, unless it is made the second syllable of an Iambus, when it is lengthened by the Ictus. II. In all simple words, a short vowel before a mute and a liquid, ought always to retain its natural quantity,¹ unless it forms the second syllable of an Iambus. And, III. A short vowel in the second syllable of the Iambic foot is lengthened in consequence of the Ictus upon it.

On this principle then, thus I hope sufficiently established, the reading ἀπλακημάτων in the Prometheus, ἀπλακῶν in the Hippolytus, and ἀπλακοῦσα in the Andromache, may be supported, and on no other if the *μ* is omitted. But as this principle will not, I am certain, be adopted either by Blomfield or Monk, though, I am equally certain, they cannot disprove it, I shall leave them contented with the power of “a præfixo πλεοναστικῶς, vel κατ’ ἐπίτασιν” to lengthen short syllables.

In v. 216. of the Prometheus, the adverb ἀμόχθι gives rise to a long and apparently labored discussion in the glossary respecting the formation of adverbs. The observations on such as end in *ι* and *αι*, do credit to the author’s ingenuity, which, however, seems to have totally failed him when he came to account for those ending in *ως*. “Adverbia cujusunque formæ,” says he, “non a secundo casu nominum, quod somniant Grammatici, sed a tertio nata esse, satis ostendit universa linguarum ratio. Horum autem pars maxima a dativo numeri pluralis orta, in *ως*

¹ There are a few exceptions to this rule, such as Porson has pointed out on v. 302. of the Hecuba: viz. that Euripides always lengthens a vowel before βλ, γλ, γμ, γν, δμ, δν. The syllable, however, will generally be found the second of an Iambus.

desinebat, (scilicet οἷς); nonnulla a dativo singularis in *αι* vel *ι*." According to this doctrine, ἀληθῶς must be formed from the dative plural, ἀληθέσι: παντῶς from παῖσι: διαφερόντως from διαφέρουσι: πρεπόντως from πρέπουσι: εὐσεβῶς or εὐσεβέως from εὐσεβέσι, and many others in a similar way. This absurd doctrine, which I confuted in the 25th No. of your Journal, and noticed also in my annotations on the word ἀμοχθί, in the *Analecta*, Vol. III., has been repeated by Blomfield in a third edition of the *Prometheus Vinctus*. If he still believes his opinion to be correct, which I can scarcely suppose he does, what are we to think of his skill as a philologist, and of his knowledge of the "universa linguarum ratio?" Or if he knows that it was long ago confuted and shown to be erroneous, what idea must we form of the temper and disposition of that man, who will rather persist in error, than even silently relinquish an untenable doctrine, because it has been exposed by a person whom he is conscious of having injured?

With these observations I shall at present take my leave of these two gentlemen, and at the same time beg leave to assure them that, whether they have any more insinuations in reserve, or prefer the more manly method of open attack, they shall find me ready to make good the assertions I have already hazarded, by producing more numerous and more formidable examples. The hostility I have experienced from them must appear to every one as mean and illiberal, as it is, I hope for the credit of literature, unprecedented among scholars, and can only be matched by the attempts of an anonymous writer to depreciate the labors of an editor, that they may not stand in the way of his own on the same subject.

GEORGE DUNBAR.

College, Edinburgh,
Feb. 1822.

ORATIONS ASCRIBED TO CICERO.

No. V.—[Continued from No. XXXVI. p. 251.]

IN Vol. i. Fasc. 1. of the Museum Antiquitatis studiorum, opera Friderici Augusti Wolfii et Philippi Buttmanni, Berolini, 1808, the first article is G. L. Spaldingii de Oratione Marcelliana Disputatio.

The erudition and sagacity of Spalding are well known from his labors on Quinctilian, of whom, he for twenty years was preparing an edition. Happily, the fruits of his labor have been largely preserved, but death prevented him from completing the Work, and the task devolved on Philip Buttmann. Spalding, like Wolfius, doubted the genuineness of the oration; and in the course of his reasonings against it, he has very ably and very fully stated his opinion on the distinction between *non solum* and *non modo*.

Accusant patroni orationis taciturnitatem Wolfii, discrimen illud vocularum *non solum* et *non modo*, quod in scholis explicandum sit, lectoribus suis invidentis; se quidem, quale illud intelligi possit, nescire. Verba Marcellianæ sunt hæc c. 10. §. 32.: “restat ut omnes unum velint qui modo habent aliquid *non solum* sapientiæ, sed etiam sanitatis.” Wormio præferenti *non solum*, causam designanti quod præcesserit qui *modo* habent, “accedit Weiskius. Equidem miror viros in Cicerone legendo multum versatos non attendisse, ubi descensus aliquis sit ad minora, ibi constanter poni *non modo*, nunquam *non solum*, velut hic qui ad *sapientiæ* gloriam non aspirant, tamen debebant *sanitatem* vindicare. Respondet Græco μή ὅτι illud *non modo*, et succedit ejus loco sæpissime *non dicam*, Qua in sententia ipse hic Marcellianæ auctor recte ponit *non dicam* §. 4.” *non dicam* exornare sed enarrare. “male autem §. 5.” *non dicam* cursibus sed victoriis.” Debebat igitur noster *modo* illud suum in præcedentibus compendifacere, ne cogeretur aut eodem vocabulo repetendo aures radere, aut *solum* ponendo Ciceronem exuere. Illam vero, quam dixi, differentiam non aliqua interpretandi libidine hic repente fingi, verum constantissimo Ciceronis usu comprobari admonitus unusquisque inter legendum sentiat. Ego exempla, quæ objiciuntur plurima, hic effundere reformido. Aliqua tamen erunt demonstranda: Epp.

ad Fam. 15, 6. "si *non modo* omnes, verum etiam multi Catones essent in civitate nostra" ad quem locum est nota Ernesti monentis esse pro *si*, *non dicam omnes, sed si* cet. Pro Sext. 20. §. 45. "jecissem me ipse potius in profundum, ut ceteros conservarem, quam illos mei tam cupidos, *non modo* ad certam mortem, sed in magnum vitæ discrimen adducerem." §. 46. "depugnarem potius cum summo, *non dicam* exitio, sed periculo *certe* vestro?" Pro Flacc. 3. §. 8. "homo *non modo* vobis, sed ne inter suos quidem notus." In Catil. 2, 12. §. 27. "cujus ego *non modo* factum, sed inceptum ullum conatumve contrapatriam deprehendero, sentiet" cet. (Huic quidem valde simile est contra Rull. 2, 33. §. 90. "nihil est in ea urbe contra hanc rempublicam, *non dico* factum, sed omnino excogitatum.") Pro Cluent. 23. §. 62. "doce—quid—*non modo* in criminis sed in maledicti loco sit objectum." 40. §. 110. "quis eum unquam *non modo* in patroni, sed in laudatoris aut advocati loco viderat?" Pro lege Manil. 22. §. 66. "quæ civitas est in Asia, quæ *non modo* imperatoris aut legati, sed unius tribuni militum animos ac spiritus capere possit?" Pro Cæc. 12. §. 35. "quæro, si te hodie domum tuam redeuntem coacti homines et armati *non modo* limine tectoque ædium tuarum, sed primo aditu vestibuloque prohibuerint, quid acturus sis." 14. §. 41. "sine cujusquam *non modo* morte, verum etiam vulnere." 26. §. 73. "jus civile—si *non modo* oppressum, sed etiam desertum aut negligentius asservatum erit, nihil est, quod quisquam sese habere certum—arbitretur." Verr. 2, 66. §. 161. "Atque ego hoc non vereor ne quid horum *non modo* impulsu, verum omnino adventu meo factum esse videatur." Verr. 1, 31. §. 79. "Video—in qua civitate *non modo* legatus populi Romani circumsessus *non modo* igni, ferro, manu, copiis oppugnatus, sed aliqua ex parte violatus sit:—ei civitati bellum indici atque inferri solere." Verr. Act. pr. 3. §. 9. "Quod si *non modo* in causa, verum in aliquo honesto præsidio—spem aliquam collocasset." Pro Rosc. Am. 38. §. 111. "In privatis rebus si qui rem inandam *non modo* malitiosius gessisset, sui quæstus aut commodi causa, verum etiam negligentius; eum majores summum admisisse dedecus existimabant." De nat. Deor. 1, 22. "Epicurus—quid dicit, quod *non modo* philosophia dignum sit, sed mediocri prudentia?" [quo loco bene utitur *ἐπιτήδεια* Halensis in A. L. Z. anni 1808. p. 36. nimium ille alioqui favens huic scriptori, nec suæ sententiæ certus, hic tamen verum videns cum ibidem in viciniâ demonstrat alteram locutionem "(Simonides) *non* poëta *solum* suavis, verum etiam cetera quoque doctus sapiensque traditur."] In omnibus hisce si descensum aliquem agnovi ad minora nolim hoc in eam partem accipi, quasi negem, etiam *non solum* poni, cum prius membrum majus est. Sunt enim loca talem usum satis aperte testantia, ut res acriore tantum quadam distinctione ad liquidum perducere possit. Velut pro Rabir. Perd. 5. §. 15. "quem *non modo* foro sed etiam cælo hoc ac spiritu censoriæ leges—carere voluerint." Hic

nihilo secius *non solum* scripseris quam *non modo*; quod apparet iis quæ mox subjiuntur §. 16. “*carnifex* vero, et obductio capitis et nomen crucis absit *non modo* a corpore civium Romanorum, sed etiam a cogitatione, oculis, auribus: harum enim omnium rerum, *non solum* eventus atque perpessio, sed etiam conditio, expectatio, mentio ipsa denique, indigna cive Romano atque homine libero est.” *Forum* majus et potius est civi Romano quam cælum patriæ et spiritus, communia illa cunctis mortalibus; *corpus* majus, quam cogitatio; sed itidem *eventus atque perpessio* superat conditionem, expectationem, mentionem ipsam. Est igitur attendendum, majora illa, ubi *non solum* aut ponitur, aut potest poni, contineri minoribus simulque cum iisdem tribui unicuique, de qua agitur, rei vel personæ. Contra si aut utrumque aut prior pars tollitur et negatur, tum solum *non modo* admittit ratio et usus Ciceronis. Carere Gracchum jubent leges censoriæ simul etiam *foro*, dum cælo ac spiritu arcent; abest *carnifex et crux* a corpore quoque, cum abest a cogitatione; *eventus et perpessio* crucis indigna sunt et ipsa homine libero, etsi magis quam ejusdem mentio. Itaque decrescit quidem magnitudo rerum, sed unius tamen utraque membra sunt conditionis. Si vero negatio est in majore, affirmatio in minore, differt ratio structuræ. Ad *mortem certam* (pro Sext. 20. §. 45.) nunquam adducturus est Cicero sui cupidos cives, sed fortasse in magnum vitæ discrimen: *exitium* (ib. §. 46.) prorsus amovetur, remanet summum periculum. *Factum* cujusquam (in Catil. 2, 12. §. 27.) non expectabit Cicero, sed inceptum et conatum deprehendet. *Limine et tecto* (pro Cæc. 12. §. 35.) redeuntem Pisonem nemo prohibebit, sed fortasse primo aditu vestibuloque. *Igni, ferro, manu, copiis* (Verr. 1, 31. §. 79.) ut legatus populi Romani oppugnatus sit, ne cogitatur quidem, sed ubi aliqua ex parte violatus fuerit, ei civitatis bellum indicitur. *Malitiosius* (pro Rosc. Am. 38. §. 111.) gerentem mandata ne comminisceretur quidem antiquitas, sed etiam negligentes in alieno negotio summo dedecore notabat. *Sapientiæ* (pro Marc. 10. §. 32.) ut quidquam habeant ii omnes, qui unum velle debent, non exigitur, sed sanitatem mentis in iis fore expectamus. Frequentius tamen est ut utrumque membrum in negationem incidat, et hæc est ratio omnium reliquorum quæ attuli. Ita fit, ut nunquam apud Ciceronem legatur: “*non hoc solum se ne illud quidem*,” verum semper, et quidem frequentissime, “*non hoc modo sed ne illud quidem*.” Quintilianus tamen I. O. 9, 4, 49. “Neque *solum* alium pro alio pedem metrorum ratio non recipit, sed *ne dactylum quidem*—alterum pro altero.” Nemo jam, spero, mirabitur, quod statuimus *non modo* quidem sæpissime succedere in locum *non solum*, sed *nunquam vicissim*. Illius rationis exemplum supra posuimus, et multa passim occurrent quærentibus, velut quod in Catil. 1, 10. §. 26. variandi plane causa “labores tui: jacere humi *non modo* ad obsidendum

stuprum, verum etiam ad facinus obeundum : vigilare *non solum* insidiantem somno maritorum, verum etiam bonis occisorum." Sed modo §. 25. nemo *solum* reposuerit "nunquam tu *non modo* otium sed ne bellum quidem nisi nefarium concupisti." Ibidem 12. §. 29. pro eo quod plerumque legitur "*non modo* se non contaminarunt, sed etiam honestarunt" codex quidam apud Beckium præfert *non solum*; impune ille, quia utrumque fert legitimus usus Tullii. p. 74.

The subject, which employed such critics as Wolfius, Weiske, and Spalding, cannot be unimportant in the estimation of Scholars. I have brought together such matter as will enable learned readers to decide between the disputants, and I have no hesitation in declaring, that my opinion is the same with those of Spalding and Wolfius—not only, that the oration is spurious, but that *non modo* has not, under all circumstances, the power of *non solum*—that, under some circumstances, they are equivalent; and that, under no circumstances, *non solum* has that peculiar power, which Wolfius and Spalding ascribe to *non modo*.

It is well known by learned men, that *non modo* put elliptically for *non modo non* is a phrase followed by SED NE QUIDEM. Perizonius, whose acuteness is no less conspicuous than his learning, maintains that the mind advances a majori in the first clause, ad minus in the second. Bayer contends, and I think with success, for the contrary. The reasoning of the two disputants is well worthy of attention. It cannot be compressed without injury to their meaning, nor can their arguments be here introduced on account of their length; they are, however, earnestly recommended to the careful perusal of Scholars of inquisitive mind. It may be found in Vol. ii., Sanctii Minerva. Ex Ed. Baveri. Cap. 7. Lib. iv. It begins p. 293, and ends in p. 304.

CORRECTIONS

In the common Translation of the New Testament.

No. VI.—[Continued from No. XLII. p. 286.]

EPISTLE to the ROMANS.

CHAPTER I. v. 1. *afore*, before.

v. 13. *let*, prevented.

v. 15. *to you that are at Rome also*, to you also who are in Rome.

v. 17. *For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith*, for the righteousness of God by faith is revealed in it, to produce faith.—*the just shall live by faith*, the just by faith shall live.

v. 18. *hold the truth in unrighteousness*, restrain the truth by their unrighteousness.

v. 24. *between*, among.

v. 25. *the truth of God*, the true God.—*into a lie*, for an idol.

v. 28. *not convenient*, unbecoming.

v. 32. *in them*, in those.

CH. II. v. 4. *Knowing*, Considering.—*leadeth*, invites.

v. 9. *upon*, to. (The construction of vv. 9, 10 is more simple in the translation than in the original.)

v. 11. Begin the parenthesis here, instead of v. 13.

v. 12. *in*, under.—*by the law*, by law.

v. 15. *thoughts*, discussions, reasonings.

v. 26. *the circumcision*, the circumcised.

v. 27. *by the letter*, and, though under the rule of.

v. 29. put from *and circumcision* to *letter* in a parenthesis.

CH. III. v. 1. *what profit is there*, what is the advantage.

v. 2. *that unto them*, to his nation.

v. 4. *sayings*, declarations.—*art judged*, judgest.

v. 5. *commend*, displays.

v. 7. *lie*, unfaithfulness.

v. 8. *whose damnation*, of these the condemnation.

v. 9. *both Jews and Gentiles*, that they, that both Jews and Gentiles.

v. 20, 28. *the deeds of the law*, deeds of law.

v. 31. *the law*, law.

CH. IV. v. 1. *as pertaining to the flesh hath found*, has obtained it by the flesh.

v. 13. *through the law*, through law.

v. 14. *which are of*, who are righteous by.—*none*, no.

v. 15. *worketh wrath*, shows that we have incurred the wrath of God.—*no transgression*, no knowledge of transgression.

v. 16. *and*, and that.

v. 17. *before*, in the presence of.

v. 18. *Who*, *He*.

v. 20. *staggered not at*, disputed not.

v. 22. *him*, Abraham.

v. 25. *delivered*, delivered to death.

CH. V. v. 5. *shed abroad in*, poured into.

v. 7. *righteous*, merely just.

v. 11. *joy*, boast.—*atonement*, the benefit of the atonement.

v. 12. *and so*, so.—*for that*, because.

v. 15. *unto many*, to the many.

v. 16. *the judgment was by one*, the judgment was by one sin.

v. 17. *by one*, by the one.

CH. VI. v. 2. *are dead*, have died.

v. 5. *shall*, should.

v. 6. *is*, was.

v. 10. *unto sin*, by sin.—*unto God*, by God.

v. 12. *thereof*, of the body.

v. 13. *instruments of unrighteousness*, unrighteous instruments.

v. 14. *shall*, should.

v. 16. *whom*, whatsoever.—*servants to obey*, to obey.—*his servants ye are to whom ye obey*, you are the slaves of what you obey.

v. 17. *ye were*, although you were.—*but ye*, yet you now.—*form of doctrine, which was delivered you*, model of doctrine, into which you were formed.

v. 19. *unto iniquity*, to commit iniquity.—*unto holiness*, to work holiness.

v. 20. *free from*, not obedient to.

CH. VII. v. 1. *Know the law*, Know law.—*he liveth*, it is in force.

v. 4. *by*, in.

v. 5. *motions of sins*, sinful passions.—*by*, under.

v. 7. *lust*, the sinfulness of lust.

v. 8. *all manner of concupiscence*, all desire to transgress.

v. 13. *sin that it might appear sin, working death in me by*

that which is good, that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful. Sin; so that it appears by the law, which is good, that sin is working death in me, and that it is proved by the commandment to be most pernicious.

v. 14. *under*, as a slave to.

v. 15. *allow*, approve.

v. 16. *I consent unto the law that it is good*, I acknowledge that the law is good.

v. 21. *a law*, this power.

v. 24. *the body of this death*, the corruption of this mortal body.

v. 25. *God, through, God*, who will deliver me through.—*law of sin*, power of sin.

CH. VIII. v. 3. *in that*, as.—*for sin*, for the expiation of sin.—*condemned*, destroyed.

v. 4. *in*, by.

v. 10. *because of sin*, with respect to sin.—*because of righteousness*, with respect to righteousness.

v. 12. *we are debtors not to*, we are not obliged by.

v. 14. *they are the*, are.

v. 19. *the creature*, the rational creature.—*of the sons*, to the sons.

v. 20, 21. *vanity*, misery.—*the same in hope*: because, it, with the hope that.

v. 23. *of our body*, from our body.

v. 26. *with groanings, which cannot be uttered*, with secret prayers.

v. 28. *the called*, called.

v. 29. *that he might be the first born among*, who was to be the leader of.

v. 34. *who also*, and who.

CH. IX. v. 3. *I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ*, for I professed myself an alien from Christ.

v. 6. *Not as though the Word of God hath taken none effect*, But the word of God cannot have failed.

v. 11. *of works*, on account of works.

v. 18. *he hardeneth*, he suffers to harden themselves.

v. 24. *us*, on us.

v. 27. *a remnant*, a remnant only.

v. 28. *For he will finish the work, and cut it short in righteousness*, finishing and cutting short the work in his justice.

v. 29. *Sabaoth*, Hosts.

CH. X. v. 19. *know*, know this.

CH. XI. v. 2. *maketh intercession*, complains.

v. 9. *let their table be*, their table shall be.

v. 17. *be*, have been.—*grafted in amongst*, grafted upon (et passim).—*and with them partakest*, to partake.

v. 23. *And they also, if they bide not still*, And even the Jews, if they persist not.

v. 25. *in part is happened to*, has fallen on a part of.

v. 26. *There shall come out of Sion the deliverer, and shall*, From Sion the deliverer will come, who will.

CH. XII. v. 7. *wait*, attend.

v. 16. *mind not*, care not for.

v. 17. *Provide things honest*, Behave honestly.

v. 19. *unto wrath*, to the Divine anger.

CH. XIII. v. 2. *damnation*, punishment.

v. 4. *For he is*, For the ruler is.—*to thee for good*, for good to thee.

v. 5. *for wrath*, for fear of his wrath.

v. 6. *For for this cause pay you tribute also, for they*, For this cause you also pay tribute, for rulers.—*upon this very thing*, to the public administration.

v. 8. *but to love*, but love to.

v. 9. *in this saying, namely*, in this.

v. 11. *and that*, and that you will observe.—*we believed*, we first believed.

v. 13. *honestly*, decently.

v. 14. *and make not provision for the flesh, to fulfill the lusts thereof*, and do not indulge sensual passions.

CH. XIV. v. 1. *not to doubtful disputations*, not regarding differences of opinions.

v. 5. *be fully persuaded in his own mind*, follow his own persuasion.

v. 14. *to him it is unclean*, it is unclean.

v. 17. *is not meat*, consists not in meat.—*but*, but in.

v. 19. *and things wherewith one may edify another*, and for mutual edification.

v. 20. *it is evil*, they become evil.

v. 21. *nor any thing*, nor to do any thing.

v. 23. *damned*, condemned.—*of faith*, from persuasion.

CH. XV. v. 5. *be like minded*, have the same mind.

v. 15. *in some sort*, partly.

v. 20. *Yea, so have I strived to preach the Gospel, not where Christ was named*, yet I have endeavoured not to preach the Gospel where Christ was acknowledged.

v. 23. *no more place*, nothing more to do.

v. 24. *if first I be somewhat filled with*, if I have first enjoyed.

v. 27. *carnal, temporal.*

v. 31. *them that do not believe, the unbelievers. I have, I am performing.*

CH. XVI. v. 5. *fruits, fruit.*

v. 10. *of Aristobulus' household, of the family of it.*

v. 21. *work fellow, fellow laborer.*

v. 23. *saluteth you, and Quartus, a brother, and Quartus, a brother, salutes you.*

C. P.

NOTICE OF

Ἐκ τῶν Πρόκλου Σχολίων εἰς Πλάτωνος Κράτυλον Ἐκ-
 λογαί. Ex Procli Scholiis in Cratylum Platonis
 Excerpta. E Codd. edidit Jo. Fr. BOISSONADE.
 Lipsiæ. 1820.

THIS publication is dedicated by the learned editor to Professor Creuzer, in the following terms: "Frid. Creuzero, Professori Heidelbergensi, Mysteriorum Philosophiæ Platoniciæ Epoptæ, Procli Lycii in Cratylum Commentariorum Reliquias offert Editor observantissimus." The reason why these Scholia are termed Excerpta merely, is thus explained in the preface: "Scholiorum illorum Procli in Cratylum epitomen edo, nec integra uspiam extare puto. Ipse etiam Holstenius, ille codicum helluo, qui olim Procli, ut et reliquorum id genus philosophorum, editionem meditatus fuit, Scholiorum in Cratylum Excerpta tantum habuit: 'Proclum' (ait Epist. p. 229. coll. p. 234.) 'in Cratylum totum legi: sunt ἐκλογαὶ majorum commentariorum satis diligenter et bono cum judicio, confectæ. Plurima sunt philologica in eo opere quæ ad antiquarum fabularum explicationem pertinent.' Atque patet ex locis quæ in Dissertatione de Nymphæo indicavit (cf. Holstenii Epistolas, p. 156.), easdem illis quas nunc vulgo eclogas legisse. Nec aliis utebatur Gassendus, qui ad Epicurea T. 1. p. 361. 362. paucula e Nostri libro testimonia protulit. Codices quoque Monacenses et Augustanus unde Creuzerus et b. Werferus sua sibi decerpse-

runt, non videntur fuisse meis ampliores. Equidem, ut copiolas recenseam meas, tres habui libros manuscriptos, binos Regios e Parisina bibliotheca 1832 et 1842, literis in annotatione A et B signatos, atque Vaticanum 1197; omnes chartaceos, recentissimos omnes. Nec non monendum est in hisce eclogis non puram semper ipsamque Procli manum exhiberi; nam identidem inexpectata prodit Epitomatoris nescio cujus oratio, Proclum laudantis, verbi causa, cap. 30. 49. 56. 112. 153."

In the 32nd and succeeding numbers of the *Classical Journal*, was inserted a collection of Chaldaean oracles by the erudite T. Taylor, several of which were selected from the Scholia of Proclus. We shall therefore extract from the notes of this edition those which relate to the discrepancies between the Oracles as exhibited by Taylor, and as found in the Mss. employed by Prof. Boissonade.

Ἀλλὰ ἐστὶν οὐνομα σεμνὸν ἀκοιμητῶ στροφαλιγγί,
Κόσμους ἐνθρῶσκων, κραιπνὴν διὰ πατρὸς ἐνιπὴν.

Class. Journ. N. xxxiv. p. 255.

Ἄλλ' ὄνομα σεμνὸν καὶ ἀκοιμήτῶ στροφάλιγγι
Κόσμοις ἐνθρῶσκον κραιπνὴν διὰ πατρὸς ἐνιπὴν.

Procl. p. 23. Ed. Boiss.

"V, ἀλλά ἐστὶν οὐνομα—στροφάλιγγόσμοις. A, ἀλλ' οὐνεμα. Cf. cap. 70. Hinc sumitum oraculum suæ collectioni Taylorus, vir in Platonicorum philosophia versatissimus, inseruit T. 17. Classicæ Ephemeridis p. 255, cum varietate, sed ea non probæ lectionis." Boiss.

Σύμβολα γὰρ πατρικὸς νόος ἐσπείρην κατὰ κόσμον,
Ὅς τὰ νοητὰ νοεῖ, καὶ ἀφραστὰ καλλωπίζει.

Class. Journ. N. xxxiv. p. 247.

Σύμβολα γὰρ πατρικὸς νόος ἔσπειρεν κατὰ κόσμον,
Ὅς τὰ νοητὰ νοεῖ καὶ ἀφραστὰ κάλλη νοεῖται.

Procl. p. 23.

"A, ἔπειρεν. B, ἔπειρον. V, ἔσπειρεν: quod firmat editum Oraculum ab Obsoræo: Σύμβολα γὰρ πατρικὸς νόος ἔσπειρεν ταῖς ψυχαῖς. V, καλληεῖται. Forte, καὶ ἀφραστὰ τὰ καλὰ νοεῖται. Taylorus, qui hoc Oraculorum e Nostri libro in suum Oraculum Syntagma transtulit T. 17. p. 247. Class. Ephemeridis, exhibet, καὶ ἀφραστὰ καλλωπίζει. Oportuit saltem ἀφραστον vel ἀφράστως." Boiss.

Παρακαλεσονται οι θεοι

Νοειν μορphen φωτος προτεθεισαν.

Class. Journ. N. xxxiv. p. 256.

Procl. p. 34. Boissonade has given προτεθεισαν, but has not noticed the variation.

Νους πατρος αραιοις εποχουμενος ιθυντηρσιν

Ακναμπτου αστραπτουσιν αμειλικτου πυρος ολκοις.

Class. Journ. N. xxxiv. p. 246.

Procl. p. 246. ἄκναπτον for ακναμπτου.

Αυτου γαρ εκθρωςκουσιν αμειλικτοιτε κεραυνοι,

Και πρηστηροδοχοι κολποι παμφεγγεος αλκης

Πατρογενουσ Εκατης, και υπεζωκος πυρος ανθος,

Ηδε κραταιον πνευμα πολλων πυριων επεκεινα.

Class. Journ. N. xxxiv. p. 245.

Τουδε γαρ εκθρωςκουσιν αμειλικτοί τε κεραυνοί

Και πρηστηροδόχοι κόλποι

Procl. p. 63.

πατρός εὐγενοῦς ἐκάστης καὶ ὑπεζωκὸς πῦρὸς ἄνθος· ἡ δὲ κραταῖον πνεῦμα πολλῶν πυρίων ἐπέκεινα.

“Verba oraculi divulsa. Pro εὐγενοῦς, A, ἀγενοῦς. B, ἀγεννῦς. Pro ἐκάστης leg. esse Ἐκάτης, patet e re, et e solenni permutatione de qua cf. cap. 170. Leg. quoque ἡδὲ, non ἡδέ. Ad intelligentiam non parum facit Psellus Exposit. Orac. p. 114. Taylorus in Collect. Oracul. T. 17. p. 245. Ephemeridis Class. sic Oraculum exhibuit; sed utrum e conjectura, an e codice, nos non docuit: Αὐτοῦ γὰρ ἐκθ.—κόλποι παμφεγγέος ἀλκῆς Πατρογενοῦς Ἐκάτης, καὶ—Ἡδὲ κρ. πν. πόλῳ πυρίων ἐπ. Equidem in Codd. inveni οὐδέ: scripsi τοῦδε e cap. 142.” Boiss.

Τα λογια περι των ταξεων προ του ουρανου ως αφθεγκτον ενεδειξατο, και προσεθηκε. Class. Journ. N. xxxiii. p. 132.

Σιγ' εχει μυστα.

Καὶ γὰρ τὰ λ. περὶ ἐκείνων ὡς ἀφθέγκτων ἐν., καὶ προς. τὸ, ‘σιγ’ ἔχει, μυστα.’ Procl. p. 72.

“Θαας” τας νοητας αιτιας το λογιον καλει, και “ προιουσας αποτου πατρος θεειν επ’ αὐτον.” Class. Journ. N. xxxiii. p. 132.

Θάας γὰρ αὐτάς καὶ τὰ λόγια καλεῖ, καὶ προ. ἀπὸ τοῦ π. θύειν ἐπ’ αὐτόν. Procl. p. 79.

232-240 Notice of Boissonade's *Proclus*.

Ρειη τοι νοερων μακαρων πηγη τε ροη τε,
 Παντων γαρ πρωτη δυναμεις κολποισιν αφραστοις
 Δεξαμενη, γενεην επι παν προχχει τροχουσαν.

Class. Journ. N. xxxiv. p. 246.

Procl. p. 85. δυνάμει for δυνάμεις.

Τροφη δε τῷ νοουντι το νοητον. Procl. in Crat. and Hesychius in voc. Νοερον. Class. Journ. N. xxxiii. p. 133.

Καὶ γὰρ τροφή τὸ νοητὸν ἐστὶ, κατὰ τὸ λόγιον, ταῖς νοεραῖς διακοσμήσεσι τῶν θεῶν. Procl. p. 97.

"Taylor. hinc sumsit in Collectione Oracul. Chaldaic. T. 17. p. 133. Class. Ephemeridis: sed Codicem non videtur sequi diligenter. Contulit vir doctiss. opportune Hesych. in Νοερόν." Boiss.

Αυτος δ' εν πρωτοις ιερευσ πυρος εργα κυβερνων,
 Κυματι ραινεσθω παγερω βαρυηχετος αλμης.

Class. Journ. N. xxxiv. p. 256.

Procl. p. 106. βαρυηχέος. "Male exhibet Taylor. βχυρηχετος." Boiss.

The remaining notes are not copious, owing to causes detailed in the preface; we shall therefore conclude this brief and imperfect outline with the following extract:

P. 93. "Simonides Platonis in Protagora, §. 87. ἀνάγκη δ' οὐδὲ θεοὶ μάχονται. Proverbium fuit inde a Simonide celebratum; sed et potuit jam ante Simonidem esse. Illustravit Heindorfius ad Plat. Protag. quocum cf. Schott. ad Zenob. 1, 5. Phalaris Ep. 83. διὰ τὴν καὶ θεῶν πλεῖον ἰσχύουσαν ἀνάγκην. Synesius Ep. 103. p. 243. C. ἀνάγκα δὲ οὐδὲ θεοὶ, φασὶ, μάχονται. Codd. duo habent hic ἀνάγκη: sed præfero Dorismum. Et hæc fuit, puto, Simonidis manus. Schol. Eurip. Or. 478. ἀνάγκα γὰρ οὐδὲ οἱ θεοὶ, φασὶ, μάχονται."

* * The perfect accuracy of the Professor is equalled only by the depth of his learning, and we can always trust his critical sagacity in the most intricate passages of classical antiquity.

AN INQUIRY

into the Symbolical Language of Ancient Art and Mythology.

BY R. P. KNIGHT.

PART VI.—[Continued from No. XLIX. p. 51.]

135. THE mythological personages Castor and Pollux, who lived and died alternately, were the same as Bacchus and Apollo : whence they were pre-eminently distinguished by the title of the great gods in some places ; though, in others, confounded with the canonised or deified mortals, the brothers of Helen.¹ Their fabulous birth from the egg, the form of which is retained in the caps usually worn by them, is a remnant of the ancient mystic allegory, upon which the more recent poetical tales have been engrafted ; whilst the two asterisks, and the two human heads, one going upwards and the other downwards, by which they are occasionally represented, more distinctly point out their symbolical meaning,² which was the alternate appearance of the sun in the upper and lower hemispheres. This meaning, being a part of what was revealed in the mysteries, is probably the reason why Apuleius mentions the seeing the sun at midnight among the circumstances of initiation, which he has obscurely and ænigmatically related.³

136. As the appearance of the one necessarily implied the cessation of the other, the tomb of Bacchus was shown at Delos near to the statue of Apollo ; and one of these mystic tombs, in the form of a large chest of porphyry, adorned with goats, leopards, and other symbolical figures, is still extant in a church at Rome. The mystic cistæ, which were carried in procession occasionally, and in which some emblem of the generative or preserving attribute was generally kept, appear to have been merely models or portable representations of these tombs, and to have had exactly the same signification. By the mythologists, Bacchus is said to have terminated his expedition in the extre-

¹ Pausan. lib. i. p. 77. ; and lib. iii. p. 242. They were also called ANAKES or Kings, and more commonly ΔΙΟΣΚΟΥΡΟΙ or Sons of Jupiter, as being pre-eminently such. Το των Διοσκουρων ιερον Ανακειον εκαλειτο. Ανακεις γαρ αυτοι παρ' Ελλη- των εκαλουντο. Schol. in Lucian. Timon.

² See medals of Istrus, which are very common.

³ Metamorph. lib. xi.

242 *An Inquiry into the Symbolical Language*

mitics of the East ; and Hercules, in the extremities of the West ; which means no more than that the nocturnal sun finishes its progress, when it mounts above the surrounding ocean in the East ; and the diurnal, when it passes the same boundary of the two hemispheres in the West.

137. The latter's being represented by the lion, explains the reason why the spouts of fountains were always made to imitate lions' heads ; which Plutarch supposes to have been, because the Nile overflowed when the sun was in the sign of the Lion :¹ but the same fashion prevails as universally in Tibet as ever it did in Ægypt, Greece, or Italy ; though neither the Grand Lama nor any of his subjects know any thing of the Nile or its overflowings ; and the signs of the zodiac were taken from the mystic symbols ; and not, as some learned authors have supposed, the mystic symbols from the signs of the zodiac. The emblematical meaning, which certain animals were employed to signify, was only some particular property generalised ; and, therefore, might easily be invented or discovered by the natural operation of the mind : but the collections of stars, named after certain animals, have no resemblance whatever to those animals ; which are therefore merely signs of convention adopted to distinguish certain portions of the heavens, which were probably consecrated to those particular personified attributes, which they respectively represented. That they had only begun to be so named in the time of Homer, and that not on account of any real or supposed resemblance, we have the testimony of a passage in the description of the shield of Achilles, in which the polar constellation is said to be called the Bear, or otherwise the Waggon ;² objects so different that it is impossible that one and the same thing should be even imagined to resemble both. We may therefore rank Plutarch's explanation with other tales of the later Ægyptian priests ; and conclude that the real intention of these symbols was to signify that the water, which they conveyed, was the gift of the diurnal sun, because separated from the salt of the sea, and distributed over the earth by exhalation. Perhaps Hercules being crowned with the foliage of the white poplar, an aquatic tree, may have had a similar meaning ; which is at least more probable than that assigned by Servius and Macrobius.³

¹ Κρηται δε και καταχασμετα των λεοντων εξιασι κρουνοους, οτι Νειλος επαγει νεον υδωρταις Αιγυπτωιν αρουραις, ηλιου τον λεοντα παροδυσοντος. *Symposiac. lib. iv. p. 670.*

² *Il. Σ. 487.*

³ *In Æn. viii. 276. Saturn. lib. iii. c. 12.*

138. Humidity in general, and particularly the Nile, was called by the Egyptians the defluxion of Osiris;¹ who was, with them the God of the Waters, in the same sense as Bacchus was among the Greeks:² whence all rivers, when personified, were represented under the form of the bull; or at least with some of the characteristic features of that animal.³ In the religion of the Hindoos this article of ancient faith, like most others, is still retained; as appears from the title, Daughter of the Sun, given to the sacred river Yamuna.⁴ The God of Destruction is also mounted on a white bull, the sacred symbol of the opposite attribute, to show the union and co-operation of both.⁵ The same meaning is more distinctly represented in an ancient Greek fragment of bronze, by a lion trampling upon the head of a bull, while a double phallus appears behind them, and shows the result.⁶ The title ΣΩΤΗΡ ΚΟΣΜΟΥ upon the composite priapic figure published by La Chausse is well known;⁷ and it is probable that the ithyphallic ceremonies, which the gross flattery of the degenerate Greeks sometimes employed to honor the Macedonian princes,⁸ had the same meaning as this title of Saviour, which was frequently conferred upon, or assumed by them.⁹ It was also occasionally applied to most of the deities who had double attributes, or were personifications of both powers; as to Hercules, Bacchus, Diana, &c.¹⁰

139. Diana was, as before observed, originally and properly the Moon; by means of which the Sun was supposed to impregnate the air, and scatter the principles of generation both active and passive over the earth: whence, like the Bacchus

¹ Ου μόνον τον Νειλον, ἀλλὰ παν ὕδασι ἅπλως Οσιρίδος ἀπορρέουσι καλεῖσθαι (οἱ Αἰγυπτίοι). Plutarch. de Is. et Osir.

² Οἱ δὲ σοφώτεροι των ἱερίων, οὐ μόνον τον Νειλον Οσίριν καλεῖσθαι, οὐδὲ Τιφωνα την βαλάνταν· ἀλλὰ Οσίριν μὲν ἅπλως ἅπασαν την ὑδροποιον ἀρχὴν καὶ δύναμιν, αἰτίαν γενέσεως καὶ σπέρματος οὐσαν νομίζοντες. Τιφωνα δὲ παν το αὐχίηρον καὶ περῶδες καὶ ξηραντικόν, ὅπως καὶ πολεμίων τῇ ὕδατι. Ibid. p. 363.

— Οὐ μόνον δὲ του οἴνου Διονυσσον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πῖσις ὕδατος φύσεως Ἑλλήνης ἡγούντα. κερὶον καὶ ὀρχήγον. Ibid. p. 364.

³ Horat. lib. iv. od. xiv. 25. et Schol. Vet. in loc. Rivers appear thus personified on the coins of many Greek cities of Sicily and Italy.

+ Sir W. Jones in the Asiatic Researches, vol. i. p. 291.

⁵ Maurice's Indian Antiquities, vol. i. pt. 1. p. 261.

⁶ On a handle of a vase in the cabinet of Mr. Knight.

⁷ Mus. Rom. s. vii. pl. 1. vol. ii.

⁸ Οἱ Αθηναῖοι ἰδεχόντο (τον Δημητρίον) οὐ μόνον θυμωμένους, καὶ στεφάνουιντας, καὶ οἰνοχρούιντας, ἀλλὰ καὶ προσόδια καὶ χοροὶ καὶ ἰθυφαλλοὶ μετ' ὀρχήσεως τῆς πόδης ἀτηγτων αὐτῶν. Athen. lib. vi. c. 15.

⁹ Ibid. c. 16.

¹⁰ Ἐτι δὲ Ἕλιος ἐπωρυμμιαν ἔχων Σωτήρ δὲ εἶναι καὶ Ἡράκλῆς. Pausan. in Arcad. c. xxxi. s. 4. See also coins of Thasus, Maronea, Agathocles, &c.

244 *An Inquiry into the Symbolical Language*

διφους and Apollo διδυμαιος, she was both male and female,¹ both heat and humidity; for the warmth of the moon was supposed to be moistening, as that of the Sun was drying.² She was called the Mother of the World;³ and the Daughter, as well as the Sister of the Sun;⁴ because the productive powers with which she impregnated the former, together with the light by which she was illumined, were supposed to be derived from the latter. By attracting or heaving the waters of the ocean, she naturally appeared to be the sovereign of humidity; and by seeming to operate so powerfully upon the constitutions of women, she equally appeared to be the patroness and regulatress of nutrition and passive generation: whence she is said to have received her nymphs, or subordinate personifications, from the ocean;⁵ and is often represented by the symbol of the sea-crab;⁶ an animal that has the property of spontaneously detaching from its own body any limb that has been hurt or mutilated, and reproducing another in its place. As the heat of the Sun animated the seminal particles of terrestrial matter, so was the humidity of the Moon supposed to nourish and mature them;⁷ and as her orbit was held to be the boundary that separated the celestial from the terrestrial world,⁸ she was the mediatrix between both; the primary subject of the one, and sovereign of the other, who

¹ Οὕτω την Οσείδος δυνάμειν ἐν τῇ Σελήνῃ τιθέντι (lege τιθεμένη.) τῇ ἰσὶν αὐτῷ γενέσιν οὖσαν συνέχει λέγουσι. διὸ καὶ μητέρα τῆς σελήνης τῷ κόσμῳ κέλευσι, καὶ φύσιν ἔχουσαν ἀρτινιθλοῦσανται, πληρύνουσιν ὅτι ἰδίου, καὶ αὐτοκράτειν, αὐτὴν δὲ παλιν εἰς τοὺς αἰεὶ προεμμένην γεννητικὰς ἀρχάς, καὶ κατὰσπεύουσιν. Plutarch. de Is. et Osir. p. 368.

² Calor solis arefacit, lunaris humectat.

Macrobi. sat. vii. c. x.

Τὴν μὲν γὰρ σὺν ἡνι γονιμον τὸ φῶς καὶ ὑγροποιον ἐχρυσαν, εὐμενὴ καὶ γυναι; ζῆον, καὶ φυτῶν εἶναι βλαστήσει. Plutarch. de Is. et Osir.

³ Plutarch. in l. c.

⁴ Ω λιπεροζωνον θυγατερ

Αἰλίου Σιθηνιαία.

Euphr. Phœn. 178.

Οὕτως Αἰγυπτοῦ καὶ οἱ φυσικῶτες. Ἡσιόδου δὲ φησὶν ἀδελφὴν ἡλίου καὶ τὴν σελήνην. Schol. in loc.

⁵ Æschyl. Prometh. Vincit. 138. Callimach. Hymn. in Dian. 13. Catullus in Gell. 84. ⁶ See cæfus of the Brettii in Italy, Himera in Sicily, &c.

⁷ Duoibus his reguntur omnia teirena, calore quidem solis per diem, humore vero lunæ per noctem.—Nam ut calore solis animantur semina, ita lunæ humore nutriuntur, penes ipsam enim et corporum omnium ratio esse dicitur et potestas. Schol. Vet. in Horat. Carm. Sec.

Luna alit ostræa, et implet echinas, et muribus fibras,

Et pecuni addit

Lucil. apud Aul. Gell. l. xx. c. 8.

⁸ Ἰσθμός γὰρ ἔστιν ἀνάγκης καὶ γενέσεως ὁ περὶ τὴν σελήνην ὁρμός. Ocell. Lucan. de Universo, p. 516. ed. Gale.

Ἀπο γὰρ τῆς σιληνιακῆς σφαιρας, ἣν ἰσχατὴν μὲν τῶν κατ' οὐρανὸν κυκλῶν, πρῶτην δὲ τῶν πρὸς ἡμᾶς, ἀναγκάζουσιν οἱ φροντισταὶ τῶν μετεωρῶν, ἀχρι γῆς ἰσχατῆς ὅαν; παντὴ τὰ ἐν; ἐρθεσεν. Philon. de Sonin. vol. i. p. 641. Oper.

tempered the subtilty of æthereal spirit to the grossness of earthly matter, so as to make them harmonise and unite.¹

140. The Greeks attributed to her the powers of destruction as well as nutrition; humidity as well as heat, contributing to putrefaction: whence sudden death was supposed to proceed from Diana as well as from Apollo; who was both the sender of disease, and the inventor of cure: for disease is the father of medicine, as Apollo was fabled to be of Æsculapius. "The rays of the Moon were thought relaxing, even to inanimate bodies, by means of their humidity: whence wood cut at the full of the moon was rejected by builders as improper for use.² The Ilithyie, supposed to preside over child-birth, were only personifications of this property,³ which seemed to facilitate delivery by slackening the powers of resistance and obstruction; and hence the crescent was universally worn as an amulet by women; as it still continues to be in the southern parts of Italy; and Juno Lucina, and Diana, were the same goddess, equally personifications of the Moon.⁴

141. The Ægyptians represented the Moon under the symbol of a cat; probably on account of that animal's power of seeing in the night; and also, perhaps, on account of its fecundity; which seems to have induced the Hindoos to adopt the rabbit as the symbol of the same deified planet.⁵ As the arch or bend of the mystical instrument, borne by Isis, and called a sistrum, represented the lunar orbit, the cat occupied the centre of it; while the rattles below represented the terrestrial elements;⁶ of which there are sometimes four, but more frequently only three in the instances now extant: for the ancient Ægyptians, or at

¹ Ἡλῖος δὲ καρδίας ἔχων δύναμιν, ὥσπερ αἷμα κινεῖται, διαπεμπει καὶ διασκεδατῶσιν ἐξ ἰσότητος θερμότητι καὶ φῶς· γῆ δὲ καὶ θαλάσση χρηταὶ κατὰ φύσιν ὁ κόσμος, ὅσα καὶ ἐν καὶ κρύπτει ζῶον· σελήνη, ἡλίου μετὰ καὶ γῆς, ὡς πῦρ κρύπτει καὶ κοιλίας ἦπαρ, ἡ τε μαλθακὸν ἄλλο σπλαγχνόν, ἐγκείμενη, τὴν τ' ἀνθρῶπιον ἀνταυτὰ διαπεμπει, καὶ τὰς ἐντυθὲν ἀναθυμιάσεις πεφει τινὶ καὶ καθάπτει λεπτονοῦσα περὶ ἐαυτὴν ἀναδιδῶσιν. Plutarch. de Facie in Oibe Lunæ, p. 928.

² Γίνεσθαι δὲ καὶ περὶ τὰ ἀψυχὰ τῶν σωματῶν ἐπιδηλοῦς ἡ τῆς σελήνης δύναμις· τῶν τε γὰρ ζῴων τὰ σπέρματα τὰς πανσεληνίαις ἀποβαλλούσιν οἱ τίκτοντες, ὥς ἀπαλὰ καὶ μυδόντα τὰ χελῶς δι' ὑγρότητα. Plutarch. Sympos. lib. iii. qu. 10.

³ —Ὅθεν οἶμαι καὶ τὴν Ἀρτεμιν, Λοχίαν καὶ Εἰλιθυίαν, οὐκ οὐσαν ἴτιραν ἢ τὴν σελήνην, ὠνομασθαι. Ibid.

⁴ Tu Lucina dolentibus

• Juno dicta puerperis

Tu potens Trivia, et notho es

Dicta lumine Iunæ.

Catull. xxiv. 13.

⁵ Maurice's Indian Antiquities, vol. i. p. 513. See fabulous reasons assigned for the Ægyptian symbol. Demetr. Phaler. s. 159.

⁶ Plutarch. de Is. et Osir. p. 376.

least some of them, appear to have known that water and air are but one substance.¹

142. The statues of Diana are always clothed, and she had the attribute of perpetual virginity; to which her common Greek name *APTEMIS* seems to allude: but the Latin name appears to be a contraction of *DIVIANA*, the feminine, according to the old Etruscan idiom, of *DIVUS*, or *ΔΙΦΟΣ*;² and therefore signifying the Goddess, or general female personification of the Divine nature, which the Moon was probably held to be in the ancient planetary worship, which preceded the symbolical. As her titles and attributes were innumerable, she was represented under an infinite variety of forms, and with an infinite variety of symbols; sometimes with three bodies, each holding appropriate emblems,³ to signify the triple extension of her power, in heaven, on earth, and under the earth; and sometimes with phallic radii enveloping a female form, to show the universal generative attribute both active and passive.⁴ The figures of her, as she was worshipped at Ephesus, seem to have consisted of an assemblage of almost every symbol, attached to the old humanised column, so as to form a composition purely emblematical;⁵ and it seems that the ancient inhabitants of the north of Europe represented their goddess *Isa* as nearly in the same manner as their rude and feeble efforts in art could accomplish; she having the many breasts to signify the nutritive attribute; and being surrounded by deer's horns instead of the animals themselves, which accompany the Ephesian statues.⁶ In sacrificing, too, the reindeer to her, it was their custom to hang the testicles round the neck of the figure,⁷ probably for the same purpose as the phallic radii, above mentioned, were employed to serve.

143. Brimo, the Tauric and Scythic Diana, was the destroyer;⁸ whence she was appeased with human victims and

¹ Ἡ γὰρ ὕγρα φύσις, ἀρχὴ καὶ γενεὶς οὐσά παντῶν ἐξ ἀρχῆς, τὰ πρῶτα τρία σωματὰ, γῆν, ἀέρα, καὶ πῦρ ποιεῖτε. Plutarch. de Is. et Osir.

² Varr. lib. iv. c. 10. Eianzi sopra le lingue morte d'Italia, vol. ii. p. 191.

³ See La Chausse Mus. Rom. vol. i. s. ii. tab. xv, &c. These figures are said to have been first made by Alcamenes, about the lxxxiv. Olympiad.

Ἀλκαμένης δὲ (ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν) πρῶτος ἀγαλματα Ἑκᾶτης τρία ποιεῖτε προσεχόμενα ἀληθνοῖς, ἢ Ἀθηναίῳ καλοῦσιν ἐπιπυργιδίῳ. Pausan. in Corinth. c. xxx. s. 2.

⁴ See Duane's coins of the Seleucidæ, tab. xiv. fig. 1 and 2.

⁵ See De la Chausse Mus. Rom. vol. i. s. ii. tab. xviii.

⁶ Ol. Rudbeck. Atlant. vol. ii. pp. 212 and 291. fig. 30 and 31. and p. 277. fig. G.

⁷ Ibid. p. 212. fig. 31. and p. 292.

⁸ Βριμω τριμορφος.

Lycophr. Cassandra, v. 1176.

Βριμω ἡ αὐτὴ ἡ Ἑκᾶτη ——— καὶ ἡ Περσεφονὴ Βριμω λεγεται· δοκεῖ δὲ ἡ αὐτὴ εἶναι Ἑκᾶτη καὶ Περσεφονή. Tzet. Schol. in eund.

other bloody rites;¹ as was also Bacchus the devourer;² who seems to have been a male personification of the same attribute, called by a general title which confounds him with another personification of a directly opposite kind. It was at the altar of Brimo, called at Sparta *Αρτεμις ορθία* or *ορθωσία*, that the Lacedæmonian boys voluntarily stood to be whipped until their lives were sometimes endangered;³ and it was during the festival of Bacchus at Alca, that the Arcadian women annually underwent a similar penance, first imposed by the Delphic oracle; but probably less rigidly enforced.⁴ Both appear to have been substitutions for human sacrifices;⁵ which the stern hierarchies of the North frequently performed; and to which the Greeks and Romans resorted upon great and awful occasions; when real danger had excited imaginary fear.⁶ It is probable, therefore, that drawing blood, though in ever so small a quantity, was necessary to complete the rite: for blood being thought to contain the principles of life, the smallest effusion of it at the altar might seem a complete sacrifice, by being a libation of the soul; the only part of the victim which the purest believers of antiquity supposed the Deity to require.⁷ In other respects, the form and nature of these rites prove them to have been expiatory; which scarcely any of the religious ceremonies of the Greeks or Romans were.

144. It is in the character of the destroying attribute, that Diana is called *ΤΑΥΡΟΠΟΙΙΑ*, and *ΒΟΩΝ ΕΛΑΤΕΙΑ*, in allusion to her being borne or drawn by bulls, like the Destroyer among the Hindoos before mentioned; and it is probable that some such symbolical composition gave rise to the fable of Jupiter and Europa; for it appears that in Phœnicia, Europa and Astartè were only different titles for the same personage, who was the deity of the Moon;⁸ comprehending both the Diana and celestial Venus of the Greeks: whence the latter was occa-

¹ See Johan. Meurs. Græc. Feriata. διμυστιγῶσις.

² Διουσω ωμαδιῶν ἐτ' ωμαστῆ. See Porphy. περὶ ἀποχῆς; l. ii. p. 221. Plutarch. in Themistoc.

³ Plutarch. in Lycurg. et Lacon. Institut.

⁴ Καὶ ἐν Διουσω τῇ ἰοῦτῃ, κατὰ μαντεύματ' ἐκ Δελφῶν, μαστιγούνται γυναῖκες, καθὰ καὶ οἱ Σπαρτιατῶν ἐφηβοὶ παρὰ τῇ Ὀρθίᾳ. Pausan. in Arcad. c. 23.

⁵ ————Θυσίαι δὲ, ὅντινα ὁ κληρὸς ἀπελαμβάνει, Λυκούργος μετεβαλὼν εἰς τὰς ἐπὶ τοῖς ἐφηβοῖς μαστιγᾶς. Pausan. in Lacon.

⁶ Plutarch. in Themistoc. Liv. Hist.

⁷ Suabo, lib. xv. p. 732.

⁸ Ἐν δὲ καὶ ἄλλο ἱόν ἐν Φοινικῇ μίτρα, το Σιδόμοιοι ἐχρυστοί, ὥς μιν αὐτοὶ λεγοῦσι, Ἀστάρτη; ἰστί' Ἀστάρτην δὲ ἰγὼ δοκίω Σιθλιαῖν ἐμμεῖναι· ὥς δὲ μοι τις τῶν ἱρώων ἀπηγγέτο, Ἑρῳπῆς ἰστί' τῆς Κηδμόν' ἀδελφῆς. Lucian. de Syria Dea, s. 4.

sionally represented armed like the former;¹ and also distinguished by epithets, which can be properly applied only to the planet, and which are certainly derived from the primitive planetary worship.² Upon the celebrated ark or box of Cypselus, Diana was represented winged, and holding a lion in one hand and a leopard in the other;³ to signify the destroying attribute, instead of the usual symbols of the bow and arrow; and in an ancient temple near the mouth of the Alpheus she was represented riding upon a gryphon;⁴ an emblematical monster composed of the united forms of the lion and eagle, the symbols of destruction and dominion.⁵ As acting under the earth, she was the same as Proserpine; except that the latter has no reference to the Moon; but was a personification of the same attributes operating in the terrestrial elements only.

145. In the simplicity of the primitive religion, Pluto and Proserpine were considered merely as the deities of death presiding over the infernal regions; and, being thought wholly inflexible and inexorable, were neither honored with any rites of worship, nor addressed in any forms of supplication:⁶ but in the mystic system they acquired a more general character; and became personifications of the active and passive modifications of the pervading Spirit concentrated in the earth. Pluto was represented with the *πολος* or modius on his head, like Venus and Isis; and, in the character of Serapis, with the patera of libation, as distributor of the waters, in one hand, and the cornucopiæ, signifying its result, in the other.⁷ His name Pluto or Plutus signifies the same as this latter symbol; and appears to have arisen from the mystic worship; his ancient title having been *ΑΙΔΗΣ* or *ΑΪΔΗΣ*, signifying the Invisible, which the Attics corrupted to Hades. Whether the title Serapis, which appears to be Ægyptian, meant a more general personification,

¹ *Ανελθουσι δὲ ἐς τὸν Ἀκροκορινθόν, κῆρος ἐστὶν Ἀφροδίτης· ἀγκληματα δὲ, αὐτὴ τε ὤπλιση, καὶ ἥλιος, καὶ Ἐρως ἔχων τέξον.* Pausan. in Corinth. c. 4. s. 7.

Also at Cythera, in the most ancient temple of Urania in all Greece, was *ῥουνοὶ ὤπλισμενον* of the goddess. Id. in Lacon. c. 23. s. 1.

² *Noctivigila, noctiluca, &c.* Plaut. Curcul. act. i. sc. iii. v. 4. "Horat. lib. iv. od. 6.

³ *Ἀρτεμις δὲ, οὐκ οἶδα ἐφ' ὅτῳ λόγῳ, περὶ γὰρ ἔχουσα ἐστὶν ἐπὶ τῶν ὤμων, καὶ τῇ μὲν δεξιᾷ κατεχεῖ παρδαλιν, τῇ δὲ ἐτέρᾳ τῶν χειρῶν λεόντα.* Pausan. in Eliac. i. c. 19. s. 1.

⁴ Strabo, lib. viii. p. 343. *Ἀρτεμις ἀναφερομένη ἐπὶ γρύπος*, a very celebrated picture of Aregon of Corinth.

⁵ See coins of Tefos, &c. in the Hunter collection.

⁶ *Iliad* I. 158. They are invoked indeed *Il. I. 565.* and *Od. K. 533.*; but only as the deities of Death.

⁷ In a small silver figure belonging to Mr. P. Knight.

or precisely the same, is difficult to ascertain; ancient authority rather favoring the latter supposition;¹ at the same time that there appears to be some difference in the figures of them now extant; those of Pluto having the hair hanging down in large masses over the neck and forehead, and differing only in the front curls from that of the celestial Jupiter; while Serapis has, in some instances, long hair formally turned back and disposed in ringlets hanging down upon his breast and shoulders like that of women. His whole person too is always enveloped in drapery reaching to his feet; wherefore he is probably meant to comprehend the attributes of both sexes; and to be a general personification, not unlike that of the Paphian Venus with the beard, before mentioned; from which it was perhaps partly taken;² there being no mention made of any such deity in Egypt prior to the Macedonian conquest; and his worship having been communicated to the Greeks by the Ptolemies; whose magnificence in constructing and adorning his temple at Alexandria was only surpassed by that of the Roman emperors in the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus.³

146. The mystic symbol called a modius or *πολος*, which is upon the heads of Pluto, Serapis, Venus, and Fortune or Isis, appears to be no other than the bell or seed-vessel of the lotus or water-lily, the nymphæa nelumbo of Linnæus. This plant, which appears to be a native of the eastern parts of Asia, and is not now found in Egypt,⁴ grows in the water; and amidst its broad leaves, which float upon the surface, puts forth a large white flower; the base and centre of which is shaped like a bell or inverted cone, and punctuated on the top with little cells or cavities, in which the seeds grow. The orifices of these cells being too small to let them drop out when ripe, they shoot forth into new plants in the places where they were formed; the bulb of the vessel serving as a matrice to nourish them until they acquire a degree of magnitude sufficient to burst it open and

¹ Οὐ γὰρ ἄλλοθεν εἶναι Σεραπίην ἢ τὸν Πλούτωνά φησι. Plutarch. de Is. et Osir.

² Πλάττουσι δὲ αὐτὴν (Ἀφροδίτην) καὶ γυνῖον ἔχουσαν· διότι καὶ ἀρρενὴ καὶ θήλειαι ἔχει ὅργανα. ταύτην γὰρ λείγουσιν ἴφορον πάσης γυναικείως, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς οὐφύος καὶ ἀνὸ λείγουσιν αὐτὴν ἀρρενῶς· τὰ δὲ κατω, θήλειαν. πλαττοῦσι δὲ αὐτὴν καὶ ἐπιττοῦ. Suidas in Aphrod.

Σεραπίδος ἐστὶν ἱερόν, ὃν Ἀθηναῖοι παρὰ Πτολεμαίου θίαν ἐσηγάγοντο· Αἰγυπτίους δὲ ἱερά Σεραπίδος, ἐπιφανιστάτον μὲν ἐστὶν Ἀλεξάνδρῳ, ἀρχαιστάτον δὲ ἐν Μιμφί. Pausan. in Att. c. 18. s. 4.

³ Amnian. Marcellin. lib. xxii.

⁴ Embassy to China, vol. ii. p. 391.

release themselves; when they sink to the bottom, or take root wherever the current happens to deposit them. Being, therefore, of a nature thus reproductive in itself, and, as it were, of a viviparous species among plants, the *nelumbo* was naturally adopted as the symbol of the productive power of the waters which spread life and vegetation over the earth. It also appeared to have a peculiar sympathy with the Sun, the great fountain of life and motion, by rising above the waters as it rose above the horizon, and sinking under them as it retired below.¹ Accordingly we find it employed in every part of the Northern hemisphere, where symbolical worship either does or ever did prevail. The sacred images of the Tartars, Japanese, and Indians, are almost all placed upon it;² and it is still sacred both in Tibet and China.³ The upper part of the base of the lingam also consists of the flower of it blended with the more distinctive characteristic of the female sex; in which that of the male is placed, in order to complete this mystic symbol of the ancient religion of the Bramins;⁴ who, in their sacred writings, speak of Brama sitting upon his lotus throne.⁵

147. On the Isiac table, the figures of Isis are represented holding the stem of this plant, surmounted by the seed-vessel, in one hand, and the circle and cross, before explained, in the other; and in a temple, delineated upon the same mystic table, are columns exactly resembling the plant, which Isis holds in her hand, except that the stem is made proportionately large, to give that stability, which is requisite to support a roof and entablature. Columns and capitals of the same kind are still existing in great numbers among the ruins of Thebes in Ægypt; and more particularly among those on the island of Philæ on the borders of Æthiopia; which was anciently held so sacred that none but priests were permitted to go upon it.⁶ These are probably the most ancient monuments of art now extant; at least, if we except some of the neighbouring temples of Thebes; both having been certainly erected when that city was the seat

¹ Theophrast. Hist. Plant. lib. iv. c. 10.

² See Kämpfer, D'Auteroche, Sonnerat, and the Asiatic Researches.

³ Embassy to Tibet, p. 143. Sir G. Staunton's Embassy to China, p. 391. vol. ii.

⁴ Sonnerat Voyage aux Indes, &c.

⁵ Bagvat Geeta, p. 91. See also the figure of him by Sir William Jones, in the Asiatic Researches, vol. i. p. 243.

⁶ Diodor. Sic. lib. i. p. 25. ed. Wess.

of wealth and empire; as it seems to have been, even proverbially, in the time of the Trojan war.¹ How long it had then been so, we can form no conjecture; but that it soon after declined, there can be little doubt; for, when the Greeks, in the reign of Psammetichus (generally computed to have been about 530 years after, but probably more) became personally acquainted with Ægypt,² Memphis had been for many ages its capital, and Thebes was in a manner deserted.

148. We may therefore reasonably infer that the greatest part of the superb edifices now remaining were executed or at least begun before the Homeric or even Trojan times, many of them being such as could not have been finished but in a long course of years, even supposing the wealth and resources of the ancient kings of Ægypt to have equalled that of the greatest of the Roman emperors. The completion of Trajan's column in three years has been justly deemed a very extraordinary effort; as there could not have been less than three hundred sculptors employed: and yet at Thebes, the ruins of which, according to Strabo, extended ten miles on both sides of the Nile,³ we find whole temples and obelisks of enormous magnitude covered with figures carved out of the hard and brittle granite of the Libyan mountains, instead of the soft and yielding marbles of Paros and Carara. To judge, too, of the mode and degree of their finish by those on the obelisk of Rameses, once a part of them, but now lying in fragments at Rome, they are far more elaborately wrought than those of Trajan's pillar.⁴

149. The age of Rameses is as uncertain as all other very ancient dates: but he has been generally supposed by modern chronologers to be the same person as Sesostris, and to have reigned at Thebes about fifteen hundred years before the Christian æra, or about three hundred before the siege of Troy. They are, however, too apt to confound personages for the purpose of contracting dates; which being merely conjectural

¹ See II. I. v. 381.

² Πρωτος (ὁ Ψαμμητικος) των κατ' Αἰγυπτον βασιλεων ανεψξε τοις αλλοις εθνεσι τα κατὰ την αλλην χωρην εμπορια. This prince was the fifth before Amasis who died in the 2d year of the 1311th Olympiad, in which Cambyses invaded Egypt. Diodor. Sic. lib. i. p. 78 and 9.

³ Και νυν δεικνυται δ' ιχνη του μεγεθους αυτης επι ογδοηκοντα σταδious το μηκος. lib. xvii. p. 816.

⁴ Figures in relief, finished in the same style, are upon the granite sarcophagus in the British Museum: it is equal to that of the finest gems, and must have been done with similar instruments.

252 *An Inquiry into the Symbolical Language*

in events of this remote antiquity, every new system-builder endeavours to adapt them to his own prejudices; and, as it has been the fashion, in modern times, to reduce as much as possible the limits of ancient history, whole reigns and even dynasties have been annihilated with the dash of a pen, notwithstanding the obstinate evidence of those stupendous monuments of art and labor, which still stand up in their defence.¹

150. From the state in which the inhabitants have been found in most newly-discovered countries, we know how slow and difficult the invention of even the commonest implements of art is; and how reluctantly men are dragged into those habits of industry, which even the first stages of culture require. Ægypt, too, being periodically overflowed, much more art and industry were required even to render it constantly habitable and capable of cultivation, than would be employed in cultivating a country not liable to inundations. Repositories must have been formed, and places of safety built, both for men and cattle: the adjoining deserts of Lybia affording neither food nor shelter for either. Before this could have been done, not only the arts and implements necessary to do it must have been invented, but the rights of property in some degree defined and ascertained; which they could only be in a regular government, the slow result of the jarring interests and passions of men; who, having long struggled with each other, acquiesce at length in the sacrifice of some part of their natural liberty in order to enjoy the rest with security. Such a government, formed upon a very complicated and artificial plan, does Ægypt appear to have possessed even in the days of Abraham, not five hundred years after the period generally allowed for the universal deluge. Yet Ægypt was a new country, gained gradually from the sea by the accumulation of the mud and sand annually brought down in the waters of the Nile; and slowly transformed, by the regularly progressive operation of time and labor, from an uninhabitable salt-marsh to the most salubrious and fertile spot in the universe.²

¹ Warburton has humorously introduced one of these chronologers proving that William the Conqueror and William the III^d were one and the same person. *Div. Leg.*

² Και γὰρ οὗτος αἱ ξηροτέρῃ ὁ τόπος φησιν εἶναι γιγνομένου, καὶ πᾶσα ἡ χώρα του ποταμοῦ προσχωτὶς οὐσα του Νείλου· διὰ δὲ το κατὰ μικρὸν ξηραίνοντων τῶν ἰλῶν, τοὺς πλησίον εἰσοικίζεσθαι, το του χρόνου μῆκος ἀφαιρῆται τὴν ἀρχὴν. Φησιν αὖ οὐν καὶ τα στοματὰ πάντα πλην ἑνὸς του Κανωβικοῦ, χυμροποιήτα καὶ οὐ του ποταμοῦ οὔτα. *Aristot. Meteor. lib. i. c. xiv.*

151. This great transformation took place, in all the lower regions, after the genealogical records of the hereditary priests of Ammon at Thebes had commenced; and, of course, after the civil and religious constitution of the government had been formed. It was the custom for every one of these priests to erect a colossal statue of himself, in wood—of which there were three hundred and forty-five shown to Hecateus and Herodotus;¹ so that, according to the Egyptian computation of three generations to a century,² which, considering the health and longevity of that people,³ is by no means unreasonable, this institution must have lasted between eleven and twelve thousand years, from the times of the first king, Menes, under whom all the country below Lake Mæris was a bog,⁴ to that of the Persian invasion, when it was the garden of the world. This is a period sufficient, but not more than sufficient, for the accomplishment of such vast revolutions, both natural and artificial; and, as it is supported by such credible testimony, there does not appear to be any solid room for suspecting it to have been less: for, as to the modern systems of chronology, deduced from doubtful passages of Scripture, and genealogies, of which a great part were probably lost during the captivity of the Jews, they bear nothing of the authority of the sacred sources from which they have been drawn. Neither let it be imagined that either Herodotus, or the priest who informed him, could have confounded symbolical figures with portraits: for all the ancient artists, even those of Egypt, were so accurate in discriminating between ideal and real characters, that the difference is at once discernible by any experienced observer, even in the wrecks and fragments of their works that are now extant.

152. But, remote as the antiquity of these Egyptian remains seems to be, the symbols which adorn them appear not to have been invented by that, but to have been copied from those of some other people, who dwelt on the other side of the Erythræan Ocean. Both the nelumbo, and the hooded snake, which are among those most frequently repeated, and most accurately

¹ Lib. ii. s. 143.

² Γενναι γὰρ τρεῖς ἀνδρῶν ἑκατονταία ἐστὶ. Ibid. s. 142.

³ Εἰσι μὲν γὰρ καὶ ἀλλῶς Αἰγυπτίοι μετὰ Λιβυῶς ἐγίγνεσθαι, πάντων ἀνθρώπων, τῶν ἄνθρωπων (ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν) εἰναι, ὅτι οὐ μεταλλάσσουσιν αἱ ἄνθρωποι. Ibid. s. 77.

⁴ Ἐπὶ τούτου, πλην τοῦ Θηβαίου νομοῦ, πάντων Αἰγυπτίων οὐκ ἔλασεν αὐτῆς οὐδὲν ὑπερὶ τῶν γυν. ἐνερθε λίμνης τῆς Μοῖρις; ἐν τῇ ἐς τὴν ἀναπλῶν ἀπὸ θαλάσσης; ἵπτα ἡμερῶν ἐστὶ ἀπὸ τὸν ποταμοῦ. Ib. s. 4.

254 *An Inquiry into the Symbolical Language*

represented upon all their sacred monuments, are, as before observed, natives of the East ; and upon the very ancient Ægyptian temple, near Girgè, figures have been observed exactly resembling those of the Indian deities, Jaggernaut, Gones, and Vishnoo. The Ægyptian architecture appears, however, to have been original and indigenous ; and in this art only the Greeks seem to have borrowed from them ; the different orders being only different modifications of the symbolical columns which the Ægyptians formed in imitation of the nelumbo plant.

153. The earliest capital seems to have been the bell, or seed-vessel, simply copied, without any alteration except a little expansion at bottom, to give it stability.¹ The leaves of some other plant were then added to it, and varied in different capitals, according to the different meanings intended to be signified by these accessory symbols.² The Greeks decorated it in the same manner, with the foliage of various plants, sometimes of the acanthus, and sometimes of the aquatic kind ;³ which are, however, generally so transformed by their excessive attention to elegance, that it is difficult to ascertain them. The most usual seems to be the Ægyptian acacia, which was probably adopted as a mystic symbol for the same reasons as the olive ; it being equally remarkable for its powers of reproduction.⁴ Theophrastus mentions a large wood of it in the Thebais ; where the olive will not grow ;⁵ so that we may reasonably suppose it to have been employed by the Ægyptians in the same symbolical sense. From them the Greeks seem to have borrowed it about the time of the Macedonian conquest ; it not occurring in any of their buildings of a much earlier date ; and as for the story of the Corinthian architect, who is said to have invented this kind of capital from observing a thorn growing round a basket, it deserves no credit, being fully contradicted by the buildings still remaining in Upper Ægypt.⁶

154. The Doric column, which appears to have been the

¹ Denon, pl. lx. 12.

² Denon, pl. lix. and lx.

³ See ib. pl. lix. 1. 2. and 3. and lx. 1. 2. 3., &c. ; where the originals from which the Greeks took their Corinthian capitals plainly appear. It might have been more properly called the Ægyptian order, as far at least as relates to the form and decoration of the capitals.

⁴ Martin in Virg. Georg. ii. 119.

⁵ Περὶ φυτόν.

⁶ If the choragic monument of Iysicrates was really erected in the time of the

only one known to the very ancient Greeks, was equally derived from the nelumbo ; its capital being the same seed-vessel pressed flat, as it appears when withered and dry ; the only state, probably, in which it had been seen in Europe. The flutes in the shaft were made to hold spears and staves ; whence a spear-holder is spoken of, in the *Odyssey*, as part of a column :¹ the triglyphs and blocks of the cornice were also derived from utility ; they having been intended to represent the projecting ends of the beams and rafters which formed the roof.

155. The Ionic capital has no bell, but volutes formed in imitation of sea-shells, which have the same symbolical meaning. To them is frequently added the ornament which architects call a honey-suckle ; but which seems to be meant for the young petals of the same flower viewed horizontally, before they are opened or expanded. Another ornament is also introduced in this capital, which they call eggs and anchors ; but which is, in fact, composed of eggs and spear-heads, the symbols of passive generative, and active destructive power ; or, in the language of mythology, of Venus and Mars.

156. These are, in reality, all the Greek orders, which are respectively distinguished by the symbolical ornaments being placed upwards, downwards, or sideways : wherefore, to invent a new order is as much impossible as to invent an attitude or position, which shall incline to neither of the three. As for the orders called Tuscan and Composite, the one is that in which there is no ornament whatsoever, and the other that in which various ornaments are placed in different directions ; so that the one is in reality no order, and the other a combination of several.

157. The columns being thus sacred symbols, the temples themselves, of which they always formed the principal part, were emblems of the Deity, signifying generally the passive productive power ; whence *ἱερίκιον*, surrounded with columns, is among the Orphic or mystic epithets of Bacchus, in his character of god of the waters ;² and his statue in that situation had the same meaning as the Indian lingam, the bull in the labyrinth, and other symbolical compositions of

Lysicrates to whom it is attributed, it must be of about the hundred and eleventh Olympiad, or three hundred and thirty years before the Christian era ; which is earlier than any other specimen of Corinthian architecture known.

¹ *Od. A.* 127.

² *Orph. Hymn.* xlv.

256 *An Inquiry into the Symbolical Language*

the same kind before cited. A variety of accessory symbols were almost always added, to enrich the sacred edifices; the Ægyptians covering the walls of the cells and the shafts of the columns with them; while the Greeks, always studious of elegance, employed them to decorate their entablatures, pediments, doors, and pavements. The extremities of the roofs were almost always adorned with a sort of scroll of raised curves, the meaning of which would not be easily discovered, were it not employed on coins evidently to represent water; not as a symbol, but as the rude effort of infant art, feebly attempting to imitate waves.²

158. The most obvious, and consequently the most ancient symbol of the productive power of the waters, was a fish; which we accordingly find the universal symbol upon many of the earliest coins; almost every symbol of the male or active power, both of generation and destruction, being occasionally placed upon it; and Dirceto, the goddess of the Phœncians, being represented by the head and body of a woman, terminating below in a fish;³ but on the Phœncian as well as Greek coins now extant, the personage is of the other sex; and in plate L. of vol. 1. of the *Select Specimens*, is engraved a beautiful figure of the mystic Cupid, or first-begotten Love, terminating in an aquatic plant; which, affording more elegance and variety of form, was employed to signify the same meaning; that is, the Spirit upon the waters; which is otherwise expressed by a similar and more common mixed figure, called a Triton, terminating in a fish, instead of an aquatic plant. The head of Proserpine appears, in numberless instances, surrounded by dolphins;⁴ and upon the very ancient medals of Sidè in Pamphylia, the pomegranate, the fruit peculiarly consecrated to her, is borne upon the back of one.⁵ By prevailing upon her to eat of it, Pluto is said to have procured her stay during half the year in the infernal regions; and a part of the Greek ceremony of marriage still consists, in many places, in the bride's treading upon a pomegranate. The flower of it is also occasionally employed as an ornament upon the diadems of both Hercules and

¹ See Stuart's *Athens*, vol. i. c. 4. pl. iii.

² See coins of Tarentum, Camerina, &c.

³ Διρκίτου; δι' εἶδος ἐν Φοινικῇ θηταίμην, θεοῖμα ξένον· ἡμισὴ μὲν γυνή· το δὲ ἄκρως ἐν μηρῶν ἐς ἀκροῦς ποδὸς ἰχθύος οὐρὴ ἀποτείνεται· ἡ δὲ ἐν τῇ ἰρῇ πολεῖ πᾶσα γυνή ἐστι. Lucian. de Syr. Dec. s. 14.

⁴ See coins of Syracuse, Motya, &c.

⁵ Mus. Hunter. tab. xlix. fig. iii. &c.

Bacchus ; and likewise forms the device of the Rhodian medals ; on some of which we have seen distinctly represented an ear of barley springing from one side of it, and the bulb of the lotus, or nelumbo, from the other. It therefore holds the place of the male, or active generative attribute ; and accordingly we find it on a bronze fragment published by Caylus, as the result of the union of the bull and lion, exactly as the more distinct symbol of the phallus is in a similar fragment above cited.' The pomegranate, therefore, in the hand of Proserpine or Juno, signifies the same as the circle and cross, before explained, in the hand of Isis ; which is the reason why Pausanias declines giving any explanation of it, lest it should lead him to divulge any of the mystic secrets of his religion.² The cone of the pine, with which the thyrsus of Bacchus is always surmounted, and which is employed in various compositions, is probably a symbol of similar import, and meaning the same, in the hand of Ariadne and her attendants, as the above-mentioned emblems do in those of Juno, Proserpine, and Isis.

159. Upon coins, Diana is often accompanied by a dog,³ esteemed to be the most sagacious and vigilant of animals ;⁴ and therefore employed by the Ægyptians as the symbol of Hermes, Mercury, or Anubis ; who was the conductor of the soul from one habitation to another ; and consequently the same, in some respects, as Brimo, Hecate, or Diana, the destroyer.⁵ In monuments of Grecian art, the cock is his most frequent symbol ; and in a small figure of brass, we have observed him sitting on a rock, with a cock on his right side, the goat on his left, and the tortoise at his feet. The ram, however, is more commonly employed to accompany him, and in some instances he appears sitting upon it :⁶ hence it is probable that both these animals

- Recueil d'Antiquités, &c. vol. vii. pl. lxxiii. fig. 1. 2. and 3.

The bull's head is, indeed, here half humanised, having only the horns and ears of the animal ; while in the more ancient fragment above cited, both symbols are unmetamorphosed.

² Το δε σῶμα της Ἥρας ἐπὶ θρόνου καθηται, μεγεθὶ μεγάχυσου μὲν καὶ ἐλεφαντος, Πολυκλείτου δὲ ἔργον· ἐπὶ δὲ οἱ στεφανίος χαρίτας ἔχων καὶ ὤλης ἐπειρασμένης· καὶ τῶν χιτῶν, ἢ μιν κερπὸν φερεῖ φοίτας, τῇ δὲ σκηπτρὸν· τὰ μὲν οὐν εἰς τὴν φοίαν (ἀπορητὲρος γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ λόγος) ἀφείσθω μοι. Corinth. c. xvii. s. 4.

³ See coins of Syracuse, &c.

⁴ Οὐ γὰρ τὸν κύνα κυρίως Ἑρμὴν λεγούσιν (οἱ Αἰγυπτίοι) ἀλλὰ τοῦ ζώου τοῦ φυλακτικόν, καὶ τὸ ἀγρυπνόν, καὶ τὸ φιλοσοφόν. Plutarch, de Is. et Osir.

⁵ Ταύτην ἑχέειν δοκεῖ περὶ Αἰγυπτίους τὴν δύναμιν ὁ Ἀνουβις οἶαν ἢ Ἑκὼτη παρ' Ἑλλήσι χθονίους ὡν ὄμιον καὶ Ὀλυμπίους. Ibid.

⁶ Particularly in an intaglio of exquisite work, in the collection of the Earl of Carlisle.

signified nearly the same ; or, at most, only different modifications of the influence of the nocturnal sun, as the cock did that of the diurnal. Hence Mercury appears to have been a personification of the power arising from both ; and we accordingly find that the old Pelasgian Mercury, so generally worshipped at Athens,¹ was a priapic figure,² and probably the same personage as the Celtic Mercury, who was the principal deity of the ancient Gauls ;³ who do not, however, appear to have had any statues of him till they received them from the Greeks and Romans.

160. In these, one hand always holds a purse, to signify that productive attribute, which is peculiarly the result of mental skill and sagacity,⁴ while the other holds the caduceus ; a symbol composed of the staff or sceptre of dominion between two serpents, the emblems of life or preservation, and therefore signifying his power over it. Hence it was always borne by heralds ; of whom Mercury, as the messenger of the gods, was the patron, and whose office was to proclaim peace, and denounce war ; of both which it might be considered as the symbol : for the staff or spear, signifying power in general,⁵ was employed by the Greeks and Romans to represent Juno⁶ and Mars ;⁷ and received divine honors all over the North, as well as the battle-axe and sword ; by the latter of which the God of War, the supreme deity of those fierce nations, was signified ;⁸ whence, to swear by the shoulder of the horse and the edge of the sword, was the most solemn and inviolable of oaths ;⁹ and deciding civil dissensions or personal disputes by duel, was consi-

¹ Αθηναίων δε ἐστὶ τὸ σχῆμα τὸ τετραγώνον ἐπὶ ταῖς Ἑρμῆς, καὶ παρὰ τούτων μιμηθῆκασι οἱ ἄλλοι. Paus. in Mess. c. xxxiii.

² Του δὲ Ἑρμῆος τὰ ἀγάλματα ὄρθα ἔχουσιν τὰ αἰδοῦναι ποιεῖντες, οὐκ ἀπ' Αἰγυπτίων μιμηθῆκασι, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ Πελισγῶν. Herodot. ii. 51.

Τοῦ Ἑρμῆος δὲ τὸ ἀγάλμα, ὃν οἱ πλῆυτῃ (Κυλλήνῃ) περισσῶς σιβεῦσι, ὄρθον ἔστιν αἰδοῦναι ἐπὶ τοῦ βελήρου. Pausan. in Eliac. ii. c. xvi. s. 3.

³ Caesar. de B. G. lib. vi.

⁴ Occulte Mercurio supplicabat (Julianus) quem mundi velociorem sensum esse, motum mentium suscitantem, theologiæ prodidere doctrinæ. Ammian. Marcellin. lib. xvi. c. 5.

⁵ Hence the expressions, κυβερνᾶν δορυ, to govern, and γενεῖν sub hasta, to be sold as a slave.

⁶ Ἦρας δὲ ἰεῖον τὸ δορυ νενομισται, καὶ τῶν ἀγάλματων αὐτῆς στηρίζεται τὰ πλίσσα, καὶ Κυριότης ἡ θεία ; ἐπωνομασται τὸ γὰρ δορυ κουρῖν ἐκελον οἱ παλαιοί. Plutarch. Quæst. Rom. p. 119.

⁷ Ἐν δὲ Ῥηγίᾳ δορυ καθιδρυμένον Ἀρεῖα προσπαγορεύουσιν. Plutarch. in Romulo.

⁸ Ab origine rerum pro diis immortalibus veteres hastas coluere : ad ejus religionis memoriam adhuc decorum simulachris hastæ adduntur. Justin. Hist. lib. xliii. c. 3. See also Herodot. lib. iv. c. 62. : Ammian. Marcellin. lib. xvii. c. 12. and lib. xxii. : Lucian. Scyth. p. 864. : Prisci Frag. in excerpt. Legat.

⁹ Mallet Introd. à l'Hist. de Danemarck, c. ix.

dered as appealing directly and immediately to the Deity. The ordeal, or trial by fire and water, which seems once to have prevailed in Greece and Italy,¹ as well as Germany and the North, is derived from the same source; it being only an appeal to the essence, instead of the symbol, of the Divine nature. The custom of swearing by the implements of war as divine emblems, appears likewise to have prevailed among the Greeks; whence *Æschylus* introduces the heroes of the *Thebaid* taking their military oath of fidelity to each other upon the point of a spear or sword.²

EPISTOLA MACARONICA AD FRATREM,

DE HIS QUÆ GESTA SUNT IN NUPERO DISSENTIENTIUM
CONVENTU, LONDINI HABITO, PRID. ID. FEBR. 1790.

BY DR. GEDDES.

TO THE READER.

HAVING been present at the late general meeting of Protestant Dissenters, at the London Tavern, I was struck with the idea, that it would be no improper subject for a Macaronic Poem.

It is the characteristic of a Macaronic Poem to be written in Latin Hexameters; but so as to admit occasionally vernacular words, either in their native form, or with a Latin inflexion. Other licenses, too, are allowed, in the measure of the lines, contrary to the strict rules of prosody; of which, however, very few have been here indulged.

If the Muse have sometimes soared beyond the Macaronic sphere, it has been owing to the dignity of the subject; which could not but raise her above her native mediocrity.

Should any classical scholar find but half the pleasure in reading this little piece, that the author experienced in composing

¹ *Ἦσαν δ' ἑτοίμασι καὶ μυστρῶν αἰγὴν χερσὶ
Καὶ περ δαίπνιν.* Sophocl. *Antig.* 270.

*Summo Decum, Sancti custos Soractis Apollo,
Quem primi colimus, cui pineus auctor arceo
Pascitur, et medium freti pietate per ignem
Cultores multa premium vestigia pruna.*

Æn. xi. 785.

² *Ὁμῆρος δ' αἰχμῆν.* V. 535.

it, he will say with honest Humphrey Clinker, 'For what we have received may we be thankful.'

EPISTOLA MACARONICA AD FRATREM.

Rem magnam poscis, Frater carissime, cum vis
Me tibi quod said was, quod done was, quodque resolved was
Nostro in conventu generali, cunque referre.
Attamen I try will; modo Macaronica Musa
Faverit, et smoothos donarit condere versus.

Est locus in London (Londini dicta Taberna)
Insignis celebris; cives quo sæpe solemus
Eatere, et drinkare—et disceptare aliquando!
Hic, una in Halla magnaue altaque, treceni
Meetavere viri, ex diversis nomine sectis;
Hi quibus et cordi est audacis dogma Socini
Hi quibus arrident potius dictamina Arij;
Hi, qui Calvinii mysteria sacra tuentur;
Hi quibus affixum est a bibaptismate nomen:
All in a word, qui se oppressos most heavily credunt
Legibus injustis, test-oathibus atque profanis!
While high-church homines in pomp et luxury vivunt;
Et placeas, postas, mercedes, munia, graspan.

Hi cuncti keen were; fari aut pugnare parati
Prisca pro causa. Bravus Beaufoius heros
Adfuit, et Sawbridge austerus, et ater Adairi
Vultus, Bourgoigni et frons pallida.¹ Proximus illi
Watson grandiloquus; post hunc argutus Ieffries,
Perdignus Chairman—et post hunc Foxius ipse;
Foxius, eloquii nostro Demosthenis ævo
Unicus adsertor; et libertatis amator
Unicus; et nondum venalis!—Plaudite, cives!
Plaudite magnanimum concivem; plaudite verum
Humani juris ultorem; et ducite plausus
Ter ternos, donec reboabunt voce columnæ.

Nec taceam Milford, Hayward; Brandhollis et illum
Cui Saxum est nomen;² sed cui non saxeus est heart,
Aut placidum Thornton, aut asperitate carentem
Shore, aut solertem populum suspendere naso
Toulmin, aut prædictum in sacro codice² Payneum!

¹ Mr. Stone of London Field.

² This alludes to a gentleman's having, by way of joke, found in the name of *John Augustus Payne* the Apocalyptic number of Antichrist, 666.

Quid referam Cleri clarissima nomina? Reesum,
Lindsaum, Kippis, conspicillisque Toërum
Insignem, et (woe's me!) violenta sorte coactum
Belshamum;¹ niveo candentem pectore Disney;
Et Price, humani generis totius amicum.

Non aderas, Priestley!—potior te cura tenebat
Rure, ubi, magna inter centum miracula rerum,
Horslæi caput in rutilantia fulminâ forgis;
Sulphuris et satagis subtilia grana parare,
Church quibus, et church-men in cœlum upblowere possis.²

Sedimus ad ternas tabulas longo ordine postas,
Et mappis mundi coveratas, et china-plattis,
Spoonibus, et knivis sharpis, furcisque trisulcis
Stratas; cum largis glassis, vinoque repletis
Bottellis, saltis, vinegarique cruetis.

Tandem Caupo ipsus, magna comitante caterva
Servorum, intravit ketus, recteque catinos
Deposuit lautos et magni ponderis.—Inde
Surrexit Mystes, palmisque oculisque levatis
Ad cœlos, numen votis precibusque rogavit
Ut nobis nostrisque epulis benedicere vellet.

Extemplo coveris sublatis, atque relectis
Viandis calidis, omnes appendimus arma;
Impetu et unanimi prostrata in fercula fertur.

Quam vehemens onsets, strages quamque exitiales
O Musa, Edidimus! tu dicere sola valebis.
Dic, first, quas acies e contra instruxerit hostis.

Bos ingens, pinguis, torvus; qui fronte minaci
Cocknæos olim timidos frightaverat omnes:
Nunc butcherorum manibus, flammaque subactus,
Nulli est terribilis; facilem præbetque triumphum
Imbelli cuivis sartori, shoemakerove!
Hunc simul aggressi sex fortes Cheapsideani
(Talibus adsueti pugnâ) in frustula slashant.

Huic bini vituli subijuncti; nulla dedere
Valoris signa aut mugitus σφῶδρα tremendos:
Hos igitur subigunt prentice-boys atque scholares.

Tres tum langueri, lana at jam tum spoliati,
Apparent; adeo sed tame, ancillula ut illos

¹ Mr. Belsham is a strong necessarian.

² See his letter to Mr. Pitt.

(Illorum "BA, BA," non territa) cedere posset :
Et cædi a quovis sese sunt sillily passi !

Hos porci totidem (hammati plerumque) sequuntur ;
Cum sex porcellis, heu nuper ab ubere matrum
Cruelly subtractis, et sæva in prælia missis.
Illorum visu, subito et simul, impetus ingens
Factus ; et in parvo momento temporis, omnes
Porci et porcelli lacerati *παύ* jacebant.

Sex pavidi lepores ; pavidi sex postea coney
Segniter accedunt ; humiles et pignora pacis
Poscere suppliciter vultu gestuque videntur.
In vain ! nam nullam veniam dabit angrius hostis,
Sic coney leporesque unam subiere ruinam.

Hactenus agminibus solis cum quadrupedatis
Certatum—nunc jam memora, quibus aspera pugna
Birdis cum aëriis orta est, fishisque marmis.

Annicola inprimis grandævus prodiit anser
(Anser centenum qui jam reachaverat annum)
Ut Nestor sapiens ; yet still animosus ut Ajax !
Hunc tamen aggreditur certus great, great city-grocer
Solus, et in quatuor (multo sudore fluente)
Desecuit partes ! populorum non sine plausu.

Anseri in auxilium duckorum pair veniunt sex
Plumporum, fattorum, in prima flore juventæ ;
Sed quibus æque animi defecit, corporis et vis.
Twelve illos manly juvenes straightway jugularunt.

Tres turcæ, quondam thrasones atque tyranni
Cortis, et ora etiam gestantes plena minarum,
Procedunt (magicis guardatis breastibus herbis)
Et, shame ! shame ! nostris audent defy dare trooppis
Cujusvis nostrum, subita tumuit jecur ira ;
Utpote qui infidam teneamur perdere gentem.
Arreptas, igitur, lævis jam sanguine tinctas
Plungimus illorum scelerata in pectora furcas,
Dum simul invictis dextris fulgentia ferra
Stringimus, et tremulos magna vi cædimus hostes.
Non ipse, Austriacas acies qui nuper ad arcem
Instruxit Belgrade, Laudhonius, eximiorem
Obtinuit palmam, vel plus memoranda trophæa ;
Quam nos in clade hac memoranda turciniana !

Gallini generis struttantis maxima venit
Turma ; ast Gallini generis quid turma valeret
Maxima pugnantis cum bold, bravisque Britannis ?
Non citius quondam De-Grassi maxima flotta

Gallorum boasta, Anglorum virtute subacta est ;
Quam nos Gallinam hanc gentem subjecimus omnem !

Perdices, merulas, turdos, larkosque canoros
Quid memorem, Cleri manibus plerumque subactos ?

Tum cum pinniferis pugnandum erat ordine fishis :

Sed hæc non fuit aut perlonga aut aspera pugna.

Nam, licet, one coddus fauces monstraret hiantes

Et qui caruleis valde metuendes in undis

Haud dubium fuerat ; sed nunc ex æquore tractus

Nolens, et sicco jussus configere campo,

Tam fessus, fragilis, fractus seemabat et excois,

Illam ut non infans vel lacteus jam timuisset.

Nullo adeo nisu bankeri clerkius illum,

Ferro non duro sed silverspoone subegit !

Turbam aliam ignavam fishorum et fishiculorum ;

Squatinas, rhombos, haddocos et makarellos,

Whitingos, carpos, et parvo corpore smeltos,

Et sprattos minimos—opus haud est commemorare.

Parva illi laus est, tales qui fuderit hostes.

Lobsterus tantum, lorica tegmine fretus,

Obstitit, et renuit nullo certamine vinci.

Tunc ego belligero Mavorti hoc voco votum :

‘ *Αρες, Αρες ! βροτολοιγε, μισαιφονε, τειχεσιπλητα !*

Si mihi lobsteri thoracem findere dones

Et duras braccas—fragmenta, ut spolia opima.

Hiscæ tuis aris mambus suspensa videbis !

Hoc voto emisso, et præsentî numine factus

Couragior, fistum clinchatum et napkine tectum

Erexi ; et, quatuor repetitis ictibus, hostem

Smashavi !—nilil huic durissima tegmina prosunt.

Sic pugna est finita, et sic victoria pãta est.

Sed qui quod sequitur, nefandum, dicere possim ?

Nam, non contenti lautis, quas præda relata

Exhibuit plenty in, dapibus ; pane atque potatis,

Caulibus, et raphanis, lactucis brocolisque,

Cum pomis, piris, orangibus atque racemis :

Ipsos, indignum ! victos voravimus hostes !

Esuries tantum potuit suadere malorum !

Placatis stomachis latrantibus, atque feroci

leglaviæ expleta ; properamus ad *Ιερα* Bacchi

Rite absolvenda, et burnantem extinguere thirstum.

Tam justa moti causa, simul et reputantes

Quæ madness fuerit perituris parcere caskis ;

Arripimus glassas, largos et ducimus haustus

Lenæi laticis—Primumque ex vite Madeiræ
 Fœcunda, forti, generosa, pocula bina
 Regis et in regis Sponsæ sorbemus honorem :
 Tertia Cambrorum, summa cum laude, litatur
 Principis eximii genio festivo et amico :
 Principis, Anglorum decoris ; quo sospite, nunquam
 Res nostras lostas, eversa que jura putabo.

Tum, tum, sherræum genuinum poscimus ; atque
 Grandibus ad brimum bumperis usque repletis,
 Surgimus : et magno præcone sonante boatu
 ‘ Foxus ! ’ extemplo pateras haurimus ad inum,
 Et novies ‘ Hurra ! ’ simul omnes vociferamus.

Beaufoio, et reliquis conscriptis patribus, anno
 Elapso nostram qui jam tuiti fuerant rem,
 Glassa epotata larga, omnia fausta precamur.

‘ Facundi calices quem non fecere disertum ? ’
 Vere olim dixit, quisquis fuit ille, poeta.
 Jam cupimus cuncti sua quæ sit copia fandi
 Monstrare, et quæ vis ardentia cudere dicta.

Thick-shortus sed homo (cui nomen, credo, *Berellus*)
 Upstartans medio, super et subsellia scandens,
 Omnis conventus oculos atque ora trahebat.
 Breech-pocket one hand fills ; tortam tenet altera chartam ;
 Chartam morosis plenam sharpisque resolvit.
 Tum pandit big-mouthum—atque, O ! quæ grandia verba
 Protulit hic noster Cicero !—Mea Musa negaret
 Vel decimam illorum, quæ dixit, dicere partem.

Sed tamen, ut crebro vel facundissima verba,
 Si fuerint nimia atque ad rem paulum adsimulata
 Dislikam generant—sic tunc genuere—Repente
 Auditur strepitus discors ; ‘dum, voce sonora,
 Pars una ‘ Hear, hear him ! ’ ‘ Move ! move ! ’ Pars altera clamat
 ‘ Move ! move ! ’ prævaluit tamen ; et, though greatly reluctant,
 Orator vehemens fit lector frigidus—atque
 Undenas promit tarde torveque RESOLVAS.

Protinus, ut mos est, motum vox una secundat
 Laudibus et tollit miris—Iratu Adairus
 Surgit ; et, aptato periwig, grandi ore profatur :
 ‘ Quis furor, o cives ! quæ vos dementia cepit ;
 Ut tam pacificas epulas turbare velitis ? ’
 Non, vanis verbis pretiosum spendere tempus
 Adsumus—Eja ergo, ventosum wagere bellum
 Cessemus ; sedem et propriam jam quisque resumat :
 Et, curis vacui, media de nocte bibamus !—

Impransi, melius res magnas discutiemus.'

Subsequitur plausus magnus—sed non generalis :

Nam quidam expressly venire, ut speechificarent.

Hos inter juvenis fervens Mancastrius unus,

Nomine Cooperus, tales dedit ore loquelas.

' Shall homines, Chairman ! hiberno tempore longum

Carpere iter, longam atque insomnes ducere noctem ;

Et nil say, nil do ?—Proh ! Jupiter ; haud ita ; no, no !

Ergo egomet, mecum et plus centum millia more, Su '

Dicimus omnimodo passandas esse RESOLVAS.

Non adeo multum, Chairman, potavimus usque

Ut non possimus de magnis thinkere rebus.

Ergo iterum dico, passandas esse RESOLVAS !

Dico passandas, passandas esse RESOLVAS !

His olli verbis, ridens, respondet Adairus :

' Pitya magna quidem est, insomnem tot parasanga-

Mensurasse viæ ; rixis implere molestis

Aulam hanc ; turbare et tam convivalia festa !

Profecto satius multo remanere fuisset

At home cum friendis, uxoribus, atque puellis :

Quam tales medio in conventu emittere voces.

Concordes quoniam convenimus, rupta querelis

Nullis sit quæso concordia.—Cumque parati

Non simus, decet ut, tot dicussare RESOLVAS :

Vah, curas vanas !—ad pocula, friends, redeamus.'

Pluribus hæc placuit sententia ; jamque sinistris

Emptas glassas manibus graspamus, ut illas

Fragranti ex testa implemus Burdigalensi ;

Cum Doctor, perverso agitatus dæmone, Fellus

Omnia spoilavit—nam bencha stans super alta,

Verba quidem sour sour, satis at facienda profatur.

' Sergeanti docto nolo concedere, Chairman !

Nos non prepared are omnes discussere pointas

Propositas—Quare nam ! Anne illas primum hodiedum

Versamus mente in ?—Quartus jam volvitur annus,

Ex quo iterum atque iterum, plerique revolvimus omnes

Harum nexus et nodos.—Nec mihi quisquam

Hoc neget—At, forsân, dicat quis ! *Esto, quid inde ?*

Idcircone juvat lites motare feroces

Festa inter, sævasque animis concordibus iras

Fundere ? Responsum hoc habeat. Discordia si quæ

Exoriat parva ; hinc non, mihi crede, timendum

Evillum minimum ; sed erit certamen amicum

Friends inter tantum—Num non, num non, sumus omnes

Dissenters?—Num non, num non causa omnibus una est?
Ergo meum votum est, passandas esse RESOLVAS.

'Brave!' tui ba exclamat vecors—Prudentior autem
Pars shakare caput visa est, et wryere mouthum.
Interea Watson sese (Saulus velut alter
In medio populi) raisans, ora et rubicunda
Ostendens; hæc est festiva voce locutus:
'Quid refert omnes Dissenters esse, et eandem
Causam agere, inter vos si tantum dissidium sit?
Hic: *Move! Move!* Ille: *Hear! Hear! Vote! Vote!* in-
tonat alter;

Dum vere moderati homines know not what to think on't;
Much less, what to say to't—For shame, cessemus, amici,
Deprecor, altisonis consumere tempora verbis.

Dico Committo referendas esse RESOLVAS
In toto—Mili sit permissum hoc edere votum.'

'Cunctorum est votum:' we cry as loud as we can cry;
Loud sed as our cry was, non terruit ille Toërum:
Qui, indignum ratus confectum perdere speechum,
Upstitit, et tabulam mountans super, haud sine nisu,
Strokavit ventrem, verba et ructare paravit.
Et quamquam quater interruptus vocibus altis
Clamantem: '*Move! Move!*' tandem patulas tamen aures
Obtinuit; satis et propectam fecit haranguan:
Sed qualem ignoro. Nam sum surdusculus; atque
Musa then exierat cœlestem sippere thæam,
And do res alias parvas; tandemque reversa est,
Rhetoris ut labiis exibant ultima verba.
Sed tamen. if sit fas externis conjecturam
Ducere de signis; certo supponere fas est,
Speechum hoc bitterum, potius quam suave, fuisse.
Pauci adeo plausus.—Multo pejora sed illi,
Fari qui post hunc tentavit, fata fuere;
Nomme (pshaw! pshaw! pshaw!) *Hubb, Hubb*—et syllaba longa.
Ter conatus erat façunda aperire labella,
Ter labra occludit loud vociferatio: '*Down, down!*'

Tum surgit Chairman; et: 'Num placet, O! generosi
Watsonis votum?'—Plerique upliftimus handas!

Sic cessant rixæ.—Sed non jam yet bonus humor
Redditus: multi nam torvos ostendere vultus,
Bitare et hippas, longum et deducere murmur

Continuant; tantæ et nebulae jam nunc oriuntur
 Ut nova scemaret subito ventura procella,
 Cum (Deus ut volucer cœlo delapsus ab alto)
 Foxius apparet; nimbos et dissipat omnes
 Flexanimis verbis, blandæ et dulcedine vocis.

Non, mihi tercentum linguas si fata dedissent,
 Et calamum puro manantem nectare—non tum
 Dicere sperarem vel scribere *ῥήματα* posse,
 Illius ex lippis quæ mellea cunque fluebant.
 Sit satis effari, non *ῥήματα* vana fuisse.

Nam velut Aprili medio si quando serenum
 Turbant cœlum Boreas, densisque nigrarit
 Nubibus; attonita et metuit Natura ruinam
 Grandineo ex nimbo—subito Sol imperat Euro
 Alipedes ut jungat equos, seseque sequatur!
 Ipse sedens curru, radiorum spicula spargit
 Purpurea; actutum et toto densissima cœlo
 Nubila depellit—Sic tunc diffusa per aulam
 Aurea vox Foxi sævas compescuit iras,
 Et lætos hilaresque ad pocula cara remisit.

Pocula surripimus.—Sed vae! vae! nulla manebant
 Ticketa:¹ nam Disney (Deuce take him) omnia lost had'
 Clubandum sic est rursum, si vina velimus.
 Omnibus at notum est, qua paupertate Poeta
 Sit pressus: cum, ergo, scirem me vix dare posse
 Unum obolum; tacitus surgo, furtimque galero
 Et baculo arreptis (nonam strikantibus horam
 Jam clockis, ferme et shutatis undique shoppis)
 Dilectos repeto contenta mente penates,
 Hæc tibi scripturus, carissime—Vive valeque.

¹ It is usual to give *tickets* to the guests, on entering, which tickets entitle them to call, after dinner, for their value in wine.

ON THE
 ORIGIN, PROGRESS, PREVALENCE, AND
 DECLINE OF IDOLATRY.

BY THE REV. GEORGE TOWNSEND.

PART VIII.—[Continued from No. XLIX. p. 63.]

SECTION XV.—*On the Progress of Idolatry, and its Prevalence in Ancient Greece.*

THE Phœnicians were accustomed, in any calamitous, or dangerous emergency, to offer in prevention of the impending calamity, as an atonement to the avenging deities, the best beloved of their children : and those whom they thus devoted, were said to be offered mystically. This custom was begun (according to the account given us by Eusebius from an extract from another writer preserved by him) by Saturn, or Il, ‘who, when he reigned in Phœnicia, and had an only son, named Jeoud, by a nymph called Anobret, being under some great calamity, sacrificed his son, being clothed with a royal habit.’ Theories built either on etymology or coincidence, are not in general worthy of notice ; but the great majority of writers on this subject unite in considering the peculiar coincidences of this narrative with that of the Scripture history of the sacrifice of Isaac ; as well as the singular agreement of the words used in this narrative of Eusebius, with those of the narrative in Genesis ; as unitedly forming a sufficiently powerful argument, to induce us to believe that the Phœnician story is but a transcript of the Scripture account, and that the custom of offering human sacrifices prevailed among the Phœnicians from the perverted notions associated with their histories of the offering of Isaac.

Ilus or Il, signified among all the oriental nations, one who was sacred. Anobret is derived by Bochart from two Hebrew words, which exactly describe the peculiar circumstances of Sarah becoming the mother of Isaac ; and corresponds with the language of St. Paul, ‘she received strength,’ &c. Jeoud is the very Hebrew word used in the original to describe Isaac ; and it signifies, ‘only legitimate son,’ not ‘only son,’ as our translation renders the word ; which is evidently incorrect, as Ishmael was alive. With the very slight alteration, ‘he taught in Phœnicia,’ from ‘he reigned there,’ we collect a consistent traditional narrative, plainly identified with that of which we

are speaking: and we cannot be called credulous, or fanciful, when we believe from such evidence that the Phœnician and Hebrew accounts describe the same events, and refer to the same persons. The Phœnicians misapprehended the history, and offered human victims. Yet their historians declare that every sacrifice of this kind was offered mystically: that is, they retained some portion of the original tradition. As the sacrifice of Isaac mystically represented the future great sacrifice of Christ, so did all the burnt-offerings of the heathens, till gradual corruption and ignorance perverted their religion, and destroyed at once their morality, their happiness, and knowledge.

Some curious facts are recorded among different and distant nations, which accurately describe the opinion commonly formed on this subject. The victim, as the great atonement, was at once the sacrifice and the god; an object of their worship, the bearer of their sins, and the receiver of all their curses. Brahma is represented by the Hindoos as being solemnly offered up in sacrifice by the assembled gods. He is denominated their victim; the hero-gods, that is, the deified ancestors of mankind, attained to Heaven by means of his immolation; yet even in the act of sacrificing him, they acknowledged his divinity, and worshipped their victim. The victim among the Hindoos is uniformly identified with the god to whom it is offered. Like the sacrifice of Isaac, their sacrifices were mystical: that is, each victim shadowed out the victim Brahma, through the offering of whom each hero-god attained to Heaven; and was at once worshipped and immolated, as representing what they call the great universal sacrifice.

Fohi, the great god of the Chinese, is known by the name, "oblation, or victim:" but in no religion of the Pagans was this idea more decidedly expressed than in that of the Mexicans. The Spanish historians tell us, that they had a strange kind of idol, which was not an image, but a real man. When they had taken a captive, they gave to him, before they sacrificed him, the name of the idol to which he was destined to be offered; and to make the resemblance more complete, they decorated him with the same ornaments. During this time, they worshipped him in the very same manner, as they worshipped the god whom he represented. When he went through the streets, the people came out to adore him, and brought their children and their sick, that he might bless and cure them. In every thing he was suffered to have his pleasure, except only that he was constantly guarded by twelve men, lest he should make his escape: but when the appointed festival arrived, this victim god, who had for months

been an object of religious veneration, was solemnly devoted in sacrifice. Is it possible to read these and similar accounts, which are evidently the relics of one ancient traditionary religion, and not perceive that such opinions could have but one origin; namely, in the perversion of the first idea which the primitive race of man had received of their future divine, and human Messiah; at once an object of our worship, and the only true propitiatory sacrifice for our offences?

Bishop Magee, in the fifth note to his work on the atonement, Maurice, Parkhurst, Faber, Bryant, and many others, have made ample collections of the terrific details of the horrid nature of these detestable cruelties. Yet none of their instances prove an earlier origin to the custom than that now assigned. The Carthaginians, who practised it to the greatest extent, certainly borrowed it from their mother country, Phœnicia. It may have travelled to India through the neighbouring Brahmanic idolaters, chiefly through the people of Sepharvaim, who were settled on the Euphrates, and practised it in the time of the kings of Israel and Judah. The Buddhites in general do not seem to have been much devoted to this superstition, though the Persians were sometimes guilty of it; and it is supposed by Mr. Maurice, that there are evident traces of its practice in the caves of the sacred Mithras. It was established among the northern nations, and afterwards in Britain, in the Hercynian, Massilian, and Arduennuan forests, by some of the early Cuthic or Gothic tribes, who were infected with this superstition. It was brought to Greece by the expatriated colonies from Egypt: in short the custom soon became universal; and, in many countries, the worshippers imagined that their deity was more easily propitiated in proportion to the number of the victims. Hence it was that in Carthage, in Britain within wicker idols, in Mexico, Peru, and elsewhere, whole hecatombs of unfortunate wretches were slaughtered at one sacrifice. Sometimes the priest pretended to foretell future destinies from consulting the entrails of the victims. Sometimes they tore the heart from the yet living body,

‘Held to the Sun their panting sacrifice,
And told aloud their cruel augury.’

And here I must be permitted to express regret at the apparent want of interest which a reading, and Christian public, take in these subjects. Mr. Faber was compelled to publish his valuable work by subscription, and the list of his subscribers, though respectable, is not large; though it contains the names of many

of his personal acquaintance and friends, many of whom put down their names from their high and justly bestowed respect for the author ; feeling, as we know they did, little peculiar interest in the subject of his work : and Mr. Nolan's bookseller, from the same want of encouragement on the part of the public, has hitherto kept back from the literature of his country, to which it would have been a valuable addition, his learned and admirable set of Boyle's Lectures on 'The Divine Legation of Abraham ;' written, and prepared for publication, by that gentleman.'

Thus have I attempted, without proposing any peculiar or connected system or theory of my own, to trace the Origin of the Pagan Idolatry. The worship of the sun appears to have been deduced not merely from its connexion with astronomy, but chiefly from its apparent resemblance to the Shechinah, which so frequently appeared to the antediluvian and early post-diluvian patriarchs: from this cause, too, originated the idea that fire was the best emblem of the Deity: from the worship of the sun too, the great god of all the idolatrous nations, the transition to the worship of the heavenly host was easy and natural. From the perversion of the doctrine of the incarnation, we may deduce demonolatry and the peculiar unmentionable ceremonies of the temple worship. From the perversion of the patriarchal custom of sacrifices, and the belief in the atonement, or rather from the misapprehension of the mystical offering of Isaac, we may deduce the cruelties of the human sacrifices. From the arkite ritual we may derive the grove, lake, and cavern worship, which were originally commemorative of the deluge, and the circumstances attending that event. I have no time to enter upon the controverted points of the origin and purport of the mysteries ; or of the worship of the lion, the bull, the serpent, or the eagle.* I have omitted too the disputed question of the Pagan divinities ; the arguments for a single or double dispersion of mankind ; the doctrines of materialism, pantheism, the continued succession of worlds ; the mundane or arkite egg ; the situation of Paradise, and the traditions connected with, or derived from ; the fall ; the notions of the four ages, and many other subjects, equally interesting and curious. Having, how-

* These were either the perverted emblems of astronomy, or of the anciently universally known figures of the Cherubim.

ever, attempted to trace the origin of idolatry, I shall endeavour to detail, as briefly as possible, its progress, its prevalence, and decline.

In the meaning of the term *Origin*, I would include the whole mass of corrupted tradition, from the first imperceptible deviation from revealed truth, to the period of the *Exodus*, when the system of vice and error had attained its acme; and it is another wonderful instance of the manner in which the presence of the Almighty adapts the various interpositions of his providence to the accomplishment of his prophecies, and to the overruling to his own glory the effects of the uncontrolled free-will of his creatures, that Moses at that particular period removed from Egypt. The period I would assign to the continued prevalence of idolatry, is that which elapsed from the *Exodus* of Moses to the advent of our Messiah. We still live in the age of the decline of idolatry; and we are taught by the inestimable, and infallible oracle, which has been gradually imparted to the world, and which has ever guided the true worshippers of *Jehovah*, that the day shall undoubtedly come when all the nations of the world shall cast their idols at the foot of the cross; and the reign of open idolatry, possibly too, the reign of vice and error, cease even in this world. Each of these periods deserves an adequate historian. These observations have become so extended, that I can only offer some few additional observations on the two periods last mentioned.

Though the origin of idolatry may be deduced from the corruption of a few simple and primevally revealed truths, I cannot but remark, that every theory which learned or ingenious men have proposed, to enable them to account for the fantastic and infamous rites of different tribes, may have some foundation, and be consequently more or less true, while the facts I have mentioned remain the same. The human mind is the same in some respects in all ages. As in Christianity, not only various countries have their peculiar mode of professing christianity; but likewise in each country innumerable sects and parties constantly exist; and as any writer would be led into error who should select the faith or discipline of any one body of nominal Christians, and maintain that this or that mode of worship alone was Christianity; so it is with the subject of idolatry. Phœnicia, Chaldæa, Egypt, India, and the northern European and Asiatic Scythæ, professed the same religion, yet each differed in many respects from the other. Each agreed in the more material features, yet each added to, or refined upon the pristine corruption,

as ambition, error, priestcraft, a love of allegory, mistaken emblems and memorials, or any other cause assigned either by Stillingfleet, Sir William Jones, the authors of several papers in the Asiatic Researches, Bryant, Maurice, or Faber, respectively influenced their decision.

Of the period between the first perversion of truth, till the time of the Exodus, we know little from other than scriptural sources. But it is certain that at the time of the Exodus the system of corruption was perfected. Even the Israelites in their journeys from Egypt to Canaan, were not only contaminated by the idolatry of Egypt, but by the idolatry of the nations around them. The rites of Baal Peor, or as he was then called, of Baal Meon, seduced them by their licentious indulgences, immediately after their escape from the pursuing Egyptians. The levitical law too, as we have already observed, was enacted to preserve the people from adopting these idolatrous customs of the neighbouring nations. To accomplish this object their law-giver not only prohibited the superstitious practices of the idolaters, but gave them precepts utterly contradictory and opposite to them: every rite or ceremony prescribed being directed against some religious observance of the heathen; so that a complete code of idolatrous worship might be collected from the enactments of the laws of Moses. Witsius has entirely refuted the notion of Spencer, that Moses adopted his system from the Egyptian rites and legislation. Whatever religious ceremonies or opinions were common to the Jews and the Egyptians, were common also, as Mr. Faber has learnedly shown, to the patriarchal uncorrupted religion which preceded both. The object to be obtained by the wandering forty years in the wilderness, was, among other things, the removal of these Tenants of Egyptian idolatry: and the whole of the history of that period proves that the corruptions of the pristine revelation had attained the greatest height, in spite of the solemn warning of the destruction of the cities of the plain, or the miraculous interpositions of Providence in behalf of the elected family of Abraham.

In proceeding to enquire into the Progress of Idolatry, the question cannot be entirely omitted, whether Egypt was colonised from India, or India from Egypt.

That chapter is one of the most valuable in his work, in which Mr. Faber, with admirable ingenuity and learning, has proved that Egypt was peopled by two distinct races of men. One, the Misraim, who behaved with uniform kindness to the Israel-

ites ; the other, the Hucos, or Palli, or Philitim, or Philistim, who were the celebrated shepherd kings, the ancestors of the Philistim, who took possession of Canaan, though they knew from ancient prophecy that it was the territory assigned to Israel. The family of the Danai, of Cadmus, and other colonies who left Egypt for Greece, and other settlements, were a part of these shepherd kings. Of these too, was the Pharaoh who was lost in the Red Sea. These tribes are most satisfactorily traced from Northern India, round the great Arabian desert, till they invaded and subdued Egypt. In the course of their progress, which was not rapid, they subdued Chaldea, and the southern provinces of Iran, and established themselves at the head of the Persian gulph. They diverged widely to the north-west of Palestine, and to the heart of Egypt, and thus formed (though not embodied under one head) an immense empire, professing the same superstitions, and filled with a fearless, hardy, and enterprising race. The existence of an empire thus extending from the borders of Nubia, (for the dynasty of the shepherds possessed the whole of Egypt, and were the founders of those immense monuments which continue to this day) through Arabia, Chaldea, and Persia, to the north of India, sufficiently accounts for that evident identity in minute observances and opinions, which existed between the superstitions of Egypt and India ; and removes all necessity for any theoretical hypothesis respecting the original imparting of a religious system by one nation to the other. The links of the chain have been long since broken to pieces, but the two mighty powers which they connected have survived the wreck of innumerable nations. The superstitions of India still remain ; as if to show mankind, even at this distant date, how degraded the human race may become ; how powerless, enervated, and contemptible, that nation will ever be, of which the religion is a religion of vice ; taming and subduing every noble, pure, and manly principle. Egypt itself, which in refinement, in science, in stupendous attempts to immortalise itself by its proud monuments of superstition, excelled every nation which professed the same worship, is still an object of curiosity to the scholar, the traveller, or the theologian. The remains of its magnificence, which demonstrate its former power and splendor, when contrasted with its present collection of wretched huts, and squalid poverty, remind us most forcibly of the curse of the prophet, which seems to be thus fulfilled to the very letter. “Egypt shall be the basest of kingdoms ; neither shall there be any more a prince of the land of Egypt.”

The history of all the respective original settlements of mankind

would likewise occupy too much time. It will be sufficient to say, that the North of Europe and Asia was overspread by the Cuthim, who either subdued their brethren wherever they went, and established their own *Buddhisms*, or their approximations to *Brahmanism*, according to their respective opinions and shades of difference.

In the history of one country, which from the recollections of early associations will be ever interesting to all who can admire eloquence, poetry, or sublimity of character, the generality among us are too much interested to permit it to be passed over in silence. Greece was peopled partly by the sons of Javan, partly by the Pelasgi, from Thrace, and partly by the Danai and other colonies from Egypt. Every school-boy is acquainted with the stories of Paganism, as they are found in the Greek writers, and though Sir William Jones in his masterly paper on the identity of the gods of India, Greece, and Egypt, has set this part of the question completely at rest; yet, as our popular knowledge of the heathen mythology is chiefly derived from the histories of Greece and Rome, I shall endeavour to point out the connexion of those countries with the inventors of the corruptions of religion, and show how those corruptions were communicated from Chaldea, and Egypt, to the original and subsequent inhabitants of ancient Greece, to its neighbouring Islands, to Hetruria, and the whole of Italy.

From the rapid conquests of the Cuthite leaders, after their emigration from Shinar, and the apparently slight resistance which they generally met, we should conclude that those tribes which had peaceably retired to their appointed settlements, were but little acquainted with the use of arms. They were certainly deficient in the sciences, arts, and enterprise which characterised their brethren; who were thus enabled to impose their own names, or the names of their gods, on all the countries they so successfully invaded: and as the involved accounts of these early periods are chiefly to be collected from traditionary rumours, isolated remarks of scholiasts and commentators, or from fanciful and contradictory annalists; we cannot be surprised at their obscurity, and the difficulty of ascertaining the truth. The memory of a former, is frequently almost obliterated by a subsequent tribe; the name only remains, of all the various colonies of settlers, who blend with each other; and thus become one people, with a variety of titles, over which one specific generic term at length predominates.

These observations are more peculiarly applicable to the early stages of Grecian history. After perusing the remarks of

Bryant, Faber, Pinkerton, Bishop Marsh, Mede, and many detached papers or remarks of various writers; I have found it almost impossible to come to any conclusion, which would not be incompatible with some reputed fact, or some general opinion, tradition, or assertion of this or that celebrated writer. I trust however that the various authorities, upon which I now rely, will induce the conviction that there is much of probability in the following remarks.

The arguments of Mede, the testimony of the several writers quoted both by him, and by Pole in his annotations, (that is in fact the testimony of the original writers in his Synopsis) seem to prove that the first inhabitants of Greece were the Saones, the sons of Javan, the son of Noah. To these succeeded the Pelasgi, who are proved by Pinkerton, and by much additional evidence by Faber, to have entered Greece by the north, through Thrace. Hence we read that the ancient teachers and poets of the Greeks were Thracians; Linus, Orpheus, Musæus, Thamyris, Eumolpus, were all of that country. The Ionians were a different tribe from the Saones, and were a branch of the great Cuthite or Pelasgic family; which gave its name to all the petty tribes of Greece; the Hellenes, the Ionim, Arcadians and others, being all called Pelasgic.

About the time of the Exodus, according to Diodorus Siculus, or about ninety years after that event, according to Manetho, several colonies of that same family of the Cuthites or Pelasgi, which had occupied the whole country between the Nile and the Gauges, were expelled from Egypt by the native Misraim, and emigrated to Greece. The leaders of these colonies are said to have been Cecrops, Danaus, Cadmus, &c.; but Bryant and Faber have clearly shown, that the names of supposed individuals are frequently the appellations of the chief god, under whose auspices the respective emigrations were conducted. Thus Danaus was one of the names of their god. In the Puranas, the Danai are noticed as one of the Cuthic tribes, who formed a part of the great nation of the shepherd kings, who invaded Egypt originally from the west. On the expulsion of these kings, the Danai took refuge with their brethren in Greece, who were of the same race with themselves, and had established themselves in those provinces by the route of Thrace and the northern parts of Greece; by Macedonia, and the coasts of the Egean, into the Peloponnesus. By these the Danai were cordially received, and were soon intermingled with them. Much might be quoted from the Greek poets, and a variety of other sources, to confirm the accuracy of this faint

outline ; but I should not have entered even so far into the subject, if this strange mixture of the same, yet different tribes, which took place at different times, did not explain many difficulties connected with the introduction and prevalence of idolatry in Greece ; as well as many apparent anomalies in several parts of their history.

Though the knowledge of the true God, and the pure patriarchal worship, had long been extinguished among the Greeks, it is needless to observe, that they were ever celebrated in the earlier periods of their history above all nations, for sublimer notions of the Deity, for a purer theoretical philosophy,—for greater regard in many instances to the moral obligations—and a more elevated style of poetry than was known elsewhere. At the same time we must acknowledge, that they were degraded by puerile conceits, and absurd superstitions ; by the infamous religious rites in the various temples of Venus, to which we have before alluded ; by the most ridiculous and groveling notions concerning the world and man—and at length, by a total disregard to the faint remnant of morality and patriotism, which survived the wreck of their former glory. They were at once a perpetual contrast to themselves, and a riddle to the world. In their religion they were philosophical, yet superstitious ; ignorant, yet conceited ; in their taste, fastidious and depraved ; unable to bear a harsh sound in the language of their poets, while they tolerated the most disgusting sentiments and gross representations. Their poets charm, their historians instruct, their critics improve, their philosophers still attract the attention of mankind. Their statesmen, their patriots, their orators, their illustrious men of every description, still continue the objects of the enthusiastic admiration of the warm-hearted, the romantic, and the ambitious of all nations : yet they were voluptuous, frivolous, and fickle, and possessed as many claims to our contempt as to our admiration and praise.

The manner in which, as I have related, their country was planted at different periods, appears to account, not only for their religion, but for their various inconsistencies of character. The effects of institutions, and conquests, and changes, and opinions, remain among nations long after the dynasties which introduced, or the power which supported them. The Greeks, we have seen, had implanted in their country the three gradations of opinion. The purer worship, the knowledge that there was one true God, prevailed in the northern provinces from the first occupation of their settlements by the sons of Noah ; the early innovations of the Pelasgi introduced an idolatry not so base

and profligate in some respects as that which was afterwards introduced by their Danaite, and Cecropian brethren : and the colonies from Egypt completed the deterioration of the people by bringing with them whatever perversions of truth had not yet become known to the Pelasgic settlers. Hence, perhaps, we may so plainly trace in the works of Æschylus and Euripides some sentiments which idolatry never could have taught them. In other passages we meet with notions which might have been entertained by the primitive innovators on truth ; such as the Persian Buddhites, or the original Cuthite seceders from Shinar ; and in other passages we read of the cruel rites and abominations which characterised the later stages of the apostacy. The philosophy which Pythagoras taught, which Gale imagines he borrowed from conversing in his travels with the Jews, then in captivity at Babylon, was in many respects the same as that which was taught in Egypt and in India long before, and which is still preserved among the Bramins. I do not mean to attribute all the varieties and inconsistencies of the Greek character to the manner in which truth and error were brought to their country ; for half the features of their character are to be attributed to their mutual jealousies, arising from their opposite systems of legislation, or the eternal contests between the factions of the few and the many, which ended in the ruin of the whole country ; by throwing the power in the hands of the orator-governed mob ; to these causes of their several peculiarities, too, must be added the wealth of one state derived from an extensive commerce, and the imposition of a tribute on the neighbouring islands, which roused the hatred of the poorer and eventually successful state. All these and many other causes, undoubtedly contributed to form the several characters which we so much admire, yet I cannot but impute their original manliness of character, their regard for morality, patriotism, and the gods, to the result of the purer influence of the primeval establishment of the opinions of the Saones, and the yet incipient idolatry of the seceders from Chaldea, under the name of the Pelasgi, Ionim, or Hellenes ; which would not for a long time permit the grosser corruptions of the colonies from Egypt, to contaminate or degrade the national simplicity.

It is impossible to describe the manner in which idolatry extended itself with the Cuthite and other colonies over the whole world. Maurice has shown the identity of the Druidical with the Braminical superstition. The north of Europe, as well as America, Britain, and Carthage, was contaminated with the cruel sacrifices of human victims, and every where the

same system of infamy, murder, and error, abundantly prevailed. The further detail must be sought in those authors who have expressly treated on the subject.

A curious question presents itself even here, which has indeed been amply discussed by Cudworth and others, but which still remains, and most probably ever will remain, undecided; it is, whether the more reflecting and speculating part of the heathen, in the days of Socrates, Xenophon and Plato, were pure theists, conforming only from custom and compliance with the public law, to the popular creed; or, whether they all held the general system of belief, rejecting only some peculiar doctrines and rites, as their caprice, or education, or reason, dictated. Whatever popular follies they rejected, they wandered on the dark mountains of that strange system of half-forgotten truth—partial light—abundant error—false reasoning—conjecture and absurdity, called natural religion. Revelation alone could guide man to truth, and they had forgotten Revelation. The humblest, the most ignorant, the most uneducated believer in Christianity, has infinitely sublimer notions of God, his works, and his attributes, than the wisest and best of the pagan world; and the utter inability, which the unassisted reason of the philosophers ever found, to discover truth, presents a wonderful confirmation of the inspiration of the books of Scripture. For, if Socrates, and Plato, and Cicero, and others, were unable to discover the most common truths, surely it is impossible that the prophets from the plough, or the apostles from the fishing-vessel, could of themselves have constructed the noble fabric of the religion of the New Testament. Socrates declared the necessity of some divine teacher, to enable man to attain to truth; and this acknowledgment of the weakness of the unassisted intellect of man has been justly considered as the best proof of his own real greatness. Cicero, without any exception, the most learned of the Romans, wrote a treatise on the nature of the gods; in the beginning of which he both declares that there is no certainty in any thing; and, that the various controversies of the wise justify scepticism. Plutarch, Laërtius, Democritus, and others, denied the existence of a Deity. Lucian in a later age, indeed, openly and perseveringly, ridiculed the whole system of the mythology. Still the religion of paganism continued. It was supported by the magistrate, venerated by the ignorance, and maintained by the superstition of the majority; till the purer light of Christianity dawned “on the dark places of the earth.”

The apostles and the earlier Christian writers directed all their eloquence against the intolerable superstition of paganism.

The expectation that some great personage was to come upon the earth prevailed through the whole of the East. Their efforts were successful. The exhortations of these illustrious teachers were not in vain. Many of their treatises are extant, and contain many curious particulars, which are engrafted into the systems, and collected in the works, of later authors. Justly is Christianity called a light which shineth in a dark place. The true Incarnate at length appeared; the oracles from some wonderful cause are generally believed to have answered their votaries no longer; and that of Apollo, if we may believe tradition, asserted to Augustus, that the Hebrew child had commanded him to depart from the temple. That this was true I dare not affirm. Whoever in the present day would avoid the charge of idiocy, must be prepared to deny the probability or possibility of a prodigy of this kind; certain it is that paganism received a blow which it never has recovered; and though the government of the world is not yet, in one sense, placed on the shoulders of the Prince of Peace; we believe that the promises and the prophecies of revelation shall be accomplished, and that the Almighty God, and the Everlasting Father will recover from their wandering and blindness the benighted family of mankind.

Truth and error are yet contending. Though the heel is bruised, the head of the serpent was, and is gradually, losing its life and its brilliance, the sparkling of its eye, the beauty of its colors, the triumph of its crest; it is falling at the feet of the promised Deliverer, and there it shall be bruised and slain. And when we consider the part which the Almighty Providence has assigned to our own great and good country in this work; we trust that we shall still be destined to maintain the magnificent influence of our lofty rank among the nations of the earth, till the promises of the Gospel be accomplished, and the whole world become christianised. We are the aristocracy of the world; the Thermopylae of the universe. By our high-mindedness and perseverance, by our calm and unsubdued attention to the best interests of mankind, whether political or religious; we have become morally superior to our brethren, and we are using that superiority for the best purposes. We deem ourselves to be under the peculiar protection of that Deity, who has blessed our efforts for the deliverance of mankind from the intolerable yoke of ambition, irreligion, and anarchy; and if we continue to act as the enlightened friends of man, we are convinced, that whatever be our temporary distresses and difficulties, we are, and ever shall be, safe under the banner of a protecting and preserving Providence.

PROPOSAL FOR A LATIN COLONY

A SMALL volume has lately appeared in France, printed at Toulouse, by Michael Olmo, S. T. D., a learned Spaniard, addressed to the Eight Great Princes, who restored peace to the world in 1815, under the title of *De Lingua Latina colenda, et civitate Latina fundanda, liber singularis*. The object of it is to recommend to the great European powers the formation of an establishment, in which the Latin language shall be exclusively spoken.

In all foreign colleges, Latin was commonly spoken in all public exercises before the Revolution, and is still used in many places. The public speeches in our Universities are still in that language; and at Oxford logical disputations were carried on in Latin with so much zeal and eagerness, that when the Moderator in the college-hall had cried *sufficit*, the combatants retired to their rooms; and continued the arguments with great strength and perseverance in a copious flow of Latin diction. We fully agree with the author in estimating the advantages that would arise from his proposed arrangement. We shall give his plan in his own words :

“Id mihi consilium fuit, vos, ô Principes, bene facere, si, ad restaurandas scientias, atque sanctæ vestræ concordæ, indeque pacis obtentæ memoriam perpetuam consecrandam, civitatem, licet principio parvulam, a qualibus sumptibus fundetis, ubi homines christiani, Latini sermonis callentes, ex toto orbe præmii atque honoribus asciti, propriis etiam legibus muniti, Latinam linguam cum posteris suis colere, et loqui in æternum sponte sua cogerentur.”

He thus proves the preference of the Latin tongue over the rest :

“Quoniam mortalium omnium haud facillè una est opinio, magnique in primis refert, in his stabilendis quæ ad bonum attinent communitatis humanæ, multitudinis suffragia gratiamque captare: æquo animo patiamini, precor vos, ô excelsi Principes, hic me nonnulla conferre pro Latini sermonis præstantiâ. In eo enim tota mea vertitur sententia, ut illud, ab istis hodiernis commodioris sapientiæ asseculis adedò neglectum, maximè colendum proponam, atque, vobis juvantibus, perpetuò conservandum, et ut pristinos honores restituendum; præsertim cum videam ejusmodi nonnullis de universali linguâ aridere sententiam, quod sæ quisque, nempe Gallus gallicæ, Anglus verò anglicæ, hunc communis usus honorem merito adjudicari deberi existiment; imò gallicam etiam exteri nonnumquam patrocinentur, illam, propter arctissimam ejus, atque, ut creditur, faciliorem syntaxim, humanæ consuetu-

dini magis idoneam arbitantes; quòd quàm longè secus sit postea dicam: malè enim præsumptum est, eas linguas, quæ rudes sunt, simpliciores esse."

He then descants on the imperfections of living languages, and enters into a curious discussion of philological subjects, and of defects in pronunciation and rhythm in the French, English, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, and German languages. He asserts that none but the Latin tongue is calculated to transmit to posterity in imperishable style the great events and the progress of science in our times.

"Nos autem, ô Invictissimi Principes, ætatem, Deo sic volente, vivimus, non modo magnis et memorabilibus rebus sæcundam, sed etiam talibus refertam inauditis eventibus et prodigiis, ut vix illa cujusquam mens aut cogitatio capere possit. Nec enim præteritorum temporum res gestæ ullæ, nec imperiorum eversiones, nec bella, nec bellorum causæ, aut genera, aut exitus cum istis possunt conferri. Quæ igitur lingua digna præ omnibus habebitur, nisi Latina, cui honos committatur factorum horum memoriam, usque ad extrema sæcula, in univrsis terris et gentibus conservandi? Quæ alia gravius, uti decet, et sublimius, stylo indelebili, venturis hominibus docebit immensa Gallorum bella, conturbationem orbis terrarum, Napoleonis casus, Summi Pontificis fidem sanctam, vestramque demùm, ô Principes, et ducum vestrorum ac militum, pro justitiâ et pace, constantiam, concordiam, et triumphos?"

"Quod si aliquandò, uti credi debet, superventuri homines, perfectiori ac magis communi sermone usi fuerint, nostram ignaviam, aut ruditatem mirabuntur, qui post tantam artium perfectionem, tot rerum inventa, scientiarum quarundam resurrectionem et restaurationem, rudium sermonum sonos veluti infantiæ doctrinæ vagitus, adhuc halutiamus, posthabito, atque despecto nunc perfectissimo, quo jam frui sumus. Nam et potuimus architecturam ab statu suo dejectam, et corruptam, post annos plus mille ducentos restituere, iidem naturalem philosophiam, depulsa, non sine vi, ab scholis inexplicabilium vocum garrulitate, ad rectas rationis et experimentorum semitas adducere; istam verò totius eloquentiæ et doctrinæ linguam, istam institutricem hominum, populorum magistram, à quâ legibus optimis, viisque omnibus ad sapientiam sumus edocti, ex hominum memoriâ penè evanescere patiemur? Has rudes et difformes tuebimur, quas non rationis delectus, sed dura necessitas, atque barbarorum victorum imperium simul cum mœrore servitutis apud nos invexit? Cùmque res omnino omnes quibus vita nostra, et societas constituitur, disciplinis, legibus, consilio, delectu, atque ratione regulentur, admirabilis scientia et utilitas sermonis fortunâ ac cæco casu moderabitur? Nam pretiosa ista ars typographica, scientiæ præsidium, omnisque scripturæ genus, quantò majorem utilitatem conferrent, si ipsa vocabula, mentis hominum signa, non diversa fuissent? Arithmeticiæ verò, quæ numerorum lingua quodammodo est, cùm notæ Romanæ vel Arabicæ, aded simplices, ac toto penè mundo communes sint, cur non magnoperè desiderabimus eandem in notis rerum concordiam?"

He proceeds to show the utility, convenience and credit of using Latin as a common language.

“ Quid enim, ô Principes invictissimi, humanius poterit excogitari, post admirabilem atque penitus ab hominum memoria singularem istam concordiam, quâ vos, vestrique populi, adversus unius hominis tyrannidem concessistis, quâque adhuc sanctissimis pactibus copulamini, quam unam tanto munere dignam linguam colere, cujus vinculo mutua inter hujus magnæ familiæ fratres charitas augeatur? Quid opportunius, vel populis vestris utilius, quàm juventutis animos, adhuc bellicis horribus, et lituo tubæ sonu permixto quasi ferocientes, ad benignas pacis artes revocare, amorem illis doctarum litterarum inspirando? Quid futuris hominibus commodius, quàm unius sermonis nexu vinci? Quid dulcius, quàm posse Europam totam, ac pene mundum ipsum, auxilio unius linguæ percurrere? Quid doctius, quàm ad unum sermonem, aliorum scientias, et populorum omnium sapientium doctrinas conferre? Quidve jucundius christiano populo, quam novâ Latinâ linguâ, uti olim, in psalmis Deo salutarî nostro jubile? Cum et ipsa Italia sanctior, et doctior mihi videretur, si Ambrosii et Læti linguâ ipsis etiam pueris iterum fuisset communis; nec solum Italia, sed Orbis totus terrarum. Multò enim satius foret Tassum, Cornelium, Garcilasum, Miltonum ipsum istis sermonibus ignorare, quàm veteres novosque magistros Latinos nescire. Tentarent verò novi Latini scriptores si vertere illos possent, et placerent sibi. Neque enim solis Græcis Sophocles, nec Latinis tantum Horatius scripsit; nec soli Hispani Cervantem suum admirati sunt. Quidni ergo diceret, dignos in Latinum honorem recipere, undè tantum illis immortalitatis ac resceret ac gloriæ, quantum ab istis pereuntibus in diem luguis nunquam poterunt obtinere?”

To prove the credit, which would for ever crown the memory of the great powers, from the foundation of the Latin city, he thus addresses them :

“ Majora quidem hæc sunt, ô Magni Principes, quàm à me dignè celebrari possint. Hæc tamen vobis cura incumbit, uti, cum otio perpetuo, filii, posteri vestri, humanum deniquè genus universum, ornatas à vobis scientias, atque à vulneribus veritati exitiali bello inflictis, sanatas, accipiant, et hujusce fraternitatis exemplum semper vigeat in hominum mente. Cum autem gloriosum in primis sit imperantibus urbes ædificare, at illud maxime regum, omnique laude dignissimum, cum condere civitatem, cujus, tam conservatio et honos scientiarum, ornatusque et utilitas generis humani, quam suorum civium commodum causa fuerit et principium. Scio enim jam à multis varias pyramidum, columnarum statuarumque species vobis fuisse propositas; cum tamen nihil horum sit quod aliquandò non consumat, et conficiat vis, tempestates, vetustas; multoque gloriosius animorum nostrorum et virtutum effigies, quàm corporum, relinquere post mortem. Et quidem nemo non videt majorem in condendis, quàm in subjugandis urbibus gloriam obtineri. Neque in armis bellicæ laudes adedò Imperatorum propriæ sunt, ut non fortuna, etiam præter virtutem militum, atque opportunitates locorum, auxilia, et alia, multum certè conferentia, maximam sibi quasi jure suo vindicet partem, omne penè suum ducens quidquid prosperè gestum est. Ista verò, Latinas musas linguamque in sedes suas stabilendi, tota ac propria vestra erit gloria; in cujus societatem sapientium fortassè consilia, populorumque vota vobiscum, non verò fortuna, nec temeritas, nec casus commiscuntur: dumque muri, templa, statuæ novæ urbis futuris sæculis

vestri nominis gloriam et munificentiam narrabunt, cives ejus, vobis maximo beneficio devincti, sapientiæ vestræ atque populorum concordie testes locupletissimi, doctæ linguæ depositum custodient, in communem scientiarum utilitatem."

The last quotation, which we shall give, proposes the situation and the name of the Latin city.

"Quod ut felix faustumque sit, invitato primum a vobis Summo Pontifice Romano, cujus auctoritati ac benignitati me, meaque omnia toto animi affectu et reverentiâ committo, necnon Siciliarum, Daniae, Sardiniae, Bavariae, Wurtembergi, et Hollandiar Regibus, Republicâ quoque Helvetiorum, omnibus demquë, qui in Europâ christiana supremam exercent auctoritatem, uti si videbitur, tam glorioso operi faveant, concilium, sive senatum quoddam doctorum hominum, Parisiis, vel aliâ ex primoribus Europæ civitate instruetis, qui vestro nomine ac auctoritate, hujus negotii curam suscipiat. Conferetis initio mercaturam territorii civitatis, cum agro suburbano satis laxo, in unaqualibet earum regionum, quæ in mediâ Europâ, sive inter Rhodanum, Rhenum, Oderam, et mare Adriaticum sitæ sunt. Situs tamen ejus non plus milliaribus quinque ab aliquâ divite et florenti urbe distabit. Habebitque Latina civitas, in honorem Romanæ eloquentiæ nomen ROMA TULLIA, veterisque regiminis, ac jura imitabitur, his adjectis, quæ, juxta præsentis temporis locique consuetudines, ab aliis liberis Europæ civitatibus assumi possint. Hæc verò, concordie fructus, vobis omnibus, populisque vestris in æternum copulabitur, non solum fœdere pacis, sed etiam patrociniû."

The author concludes by proposing laws and regulations for his Colony, and by endeavouring to remove objections, which may be urged against the adoption of a plan, which we consider as ingenious and plausible, but, we fear, visionary.

MEMOIR

On the Antiquity of the Zodiacs of ESNEH and DENDERA.

PART IV.—[*Concluded from No. XLIX. p. 80.*]

DODECATEMORION OF CANCER.

THERE are six boats allotted to this dodecatemorion. Three of these belong to the decans: the three others, which are placed in the upper row, are probably intended, with the two supernumerary boats mentioned by M. Visconti, to indicate the five additional days. These five days were

reckoned at the end of the vague sacerdotal year; and it follows, that this zodiac was constructed for the period when the Thoth of the vague year corresponded with the Sun's place in the 14th degree of the constellation, or dodecatemorion of Cancer. It will then be difficult to refer the zodiac to any other period than that which I have assigned to it—the year 1322 before our æra.

But here then, it will perhaps be said, is a proof that the year of 365 days, six hours, was not known when this zodiac was constructed. I confess this was my own opinion, when I first looked at it. But on a more attentive examination, I have found reason to change this opinion. In the lower row, which is occupied by the decans, I find 36 small rectangular frames; and allowing two more for the decans defaced near Leo, we may reckon these frames at 38 in number. In the first decan of Leo there is no frame—in the dodecatemorion of Cancer there are no less than four of these frames. Now I observe, that in the whole zodiac all the frames are filled up with small hieroglyphics, except three in Cancer, which are blank. We have then 35 frames filled up with hieroglyphics; and these, I conceive, may be explained by what Diodorus Siculus tells us of the method of dividing the astral Genii among the Chaldeans. He says, “that they held, that the five Planets command thirty stars, which are called divine counsellors. Half of these govern all things under the earth, and the other half watch over the actions of men, or observe what passes in the heavens. Every tenth day the Planets send a star under the earth, at the same time that another star rises from it, to notify to them what is going forwards.” The 35 rectangular frames filled with hieroglyphics, seem to relate to this astrological dream about the 5 Planets and 30 Stars. But the 4 squares in the dodecatemorion of Cancer may have borne a more important meaning. Horapollon informs us, certainly in not very clear language, that “they, (the Egyptians) writing, or painting, (γράφοντες) the present year, wrote, or painted, the fourth part of an acre, (τέταρτον ἀρούρας γράφουσιν.)” How they managed to do this, the author does not tell us. He afterwards says, “Wishing to indicate a year, they say a fourth; because they report that from one rising to another, of the star Sothis, a fourth part of a day is to be added, as the year of the God is of 365 days; wherefore the Egyptians reckon an additional day every fourth year; for four fourth parts of a day are equal to one

whole day." Now we are to observe, what has not hitherto been remarked, that there were two Sothic periods—one of years, and one of days. 1460 days were equal to 4 vague years; and 1461 days completed 4 astronomical years, with an error, it is true, of 44' 48". It appears that the 4 parts of the intercalated day were represented by the 4 parts of an *aroura*, or acre; and these, I conclude, were denoted by 4 quadrangular rectangular figures. The 4 square frames in the dodecatemoron of Cancer, in the zodiac before us, appear to be connected with this subject. They may have represented the 4 parts of the *aroura*. One of these was filled up, because the first of the 4 years was accomplished; and the other 3 squares were left blank, to indicate that the 3 remaining fourths of a day were yet wanting, and that consequently the zodiac was framed the first year of the four. If my conjecture be well-founded, as I think it is, the year of 365 days, 6 hours, was of course known to the Egyptians 1322 years before our æra.

The boats in the lower row contain the Genii, or daemons, (in the Greek sense of the word,) who presided over 10 degrees, each, of the sign to which they belonged. The boat, which is next to Gemini, contains a figure, which I conclude to be that of Thoth *ἱβικέφαλος*. The ibis was one of the symbols of this Divinity, and was the form which he occasionally assumed. Hence in a hymn addressed to Hermes by one Pherecydes, we find the words *Ἦν Ἑρμῆς ἱβιμορφος*, &c. This hymn is quoted by Kircher; but I suspect it not to have been written by Pherecydes, who, if I mistake not, was not a poet, as Kircher would lead us to suppose, but a scholiast, who may have quoted these lines from some more ancient writer. Horapollo likewise tells us, that the ibis was attributed to Hermes (p. 55). This bird begins to frequent the borders of the Nile, as we learn from M. Savigny, about the summer solstice, and consequently at the commencement of the inundation. The Dog-star, over which Thoth presided in his character of Anubis, rose cosmically, when the Sun 1322 years before our æra entered the dodecatemoron of Cancer, reckoning by the real zodiac; and about 12 or 14 days before the solstice, and before the heliacal rising of the same star.

The boat, which belongs to the second decan, contains the figure of a Divinity with a hawk's head, over which is represented a serpent issuing out of an egg. This serpent is the symbol of the Agathodaemon, or Good Genius, whom

the Egyptians called **Kneph**.—*Φοίνικες αὐτὸ (the 'serpent) ἀγαθὴν δαίμονα καλοῦσιν, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ Αἰγύπτιοι Κνήφ ἐπονομάζουσι.* (Euseb. Præp. Evang. l. 1. c. 10.) The egg was the emblem of the world:—*ἐρμηνεύουσι δὲ τὸ ὄν τὸν κόσμον*, says Porphyry. It was feigned to have been produced out of the mouth of Kneph, the type of the spiritual Creator; and Ptha, the material Demiurgus, who in fact is the same with Kneph, came forth from the egg. (Euseb. l. 3. c. 11.) But the Greeks, who did not understand this mythology, have confused it. Kneph or Knuph, or more properly *ich-nouph*, (**ΙϠ-ΗΟΥΦΙ**), as Jablonski has restored the name—the Good Genius,—brings forth the mundane egg, and this egg produces the Good Genius. Thus the world was created by God, and God is manifested by the world.

In the third boat are three figures. Two deities, one male, the other female, are seated. The third, a female, stands beside them, and seems to be of inferior rank. In the two preceding decans, the two deities placed there, as well as the two who are seated in this, bear each a sceptre with the head of the bird called *cucupha*. This sceptre was a symbol of Divinity; for Horapollo, after observing the grateful affection of the *cucupha* for its parents, adds,—*ὅθεν καὶ τῶν θείων σκήπτρων κουκουφὰ προτίμησις ἐστὶ.* I observe that a scarabæus is placed over the head of each of the two deities, who are seated, and I thence conclude, that they must be Ptha and Neitha. The reader may consult Horapollo, p. 24; but the passage appears to be corrupted. I understand it to signify, that Ptha and Neitha were symbolised either by a vulture or by a scarabæus. It is to be observed, that these deities are seated; and the Egyptians appear to have generally represented Neitha at least in a sitting posture—*καὶ οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι Ἀθηναῖς ἀγαλμα καθήμενης ἰδρύσαντο.* A scarabæus is placed over the head of each of these deities, not only to indicate them as Ptha and Neitha, but to show them as the emblems of the Sun and Moon in conjunction, in the sign of Cancer, represented by a scarabæus. The manner in which the scarabæus indicated the conjunction of the Sun and Moon, is detailed by Horapollo; and the Egyptians fancied, that the material Demiurgus had generated the world when the Sun was in the sign, which they represented by a scarabæus (See Porphyry as cited above.)

The first boat in the upper row contains two figures. One of these is Isis pouring forth water from two small

vases. Isis here denotes the rising of that star, which was sometimes called by her name; and the heliacal rising of this star always announced to the Egyptians the inundation of the Nile.

In the next boat is the white cow, sacred to Isis; and worshipped with peculiar veneration in the name which the Greeks called *Ἀφροδιτοπολίτης*. (See Strabo, l. 17.)

A hawk perched on a lotus-flower is the symbol which follows. The hawk was the emblem of several deities,—of Osiris, Horus, Thoth. But as the lotus was sacred to Horus, I suppose him to be here symbolised by the hawk.

The figure in the third boat may be also that of Horus.

DODECATEMORION OF LEO.

This dodecatemorion is in part defaced. In the first boat of the lower row we find Horus *ἱερακίφαλος*. The constellation of Leo was the domicile of Horus. For this reason the throne of Horus was supported by lions. (See Horapollo, p. 33.) In the second boat is a female figure, who lays her finger upon her lip. I take this figure to be that of Buto, the nurse of Horus, who concealed him during his childhood from the researches of Typhon. Before this deity a serpent, the symbol of the agatha-dæmon, is placed. The third decan is totally obliterated.

In the upper row the lion is represented standing on a barge,—the head of a serpent at the prow, and the head of a ram at the stern—the symbols of Amoun and Kneph. A female figure precedes, and another female figure follows the lion.

Between the signs of Leo and Virgo we find a twisted serpent enclosed in a rectangular frame. This indicates the constellation of Hydra, which is a paratanellon of Leo and Virgo. By the word paratanellon, I mean a star, or constellation, which rises either with, or opposite to, another.

DODECATEMORION OF VIRGO.

Three male figures of Divinities, each bearing a sceptre with the head of a cucupha, are placed in the three boats belonging to the decans of this dodecatemorion. In the upper row there are several symbolical figures. The three first figures are female, and the last of these is the figure of Isis bearing an ear of corn in her hand. She is without a diadem; and is followed by Thoth *ταυροκέφαλος*. Plutarch mentions

that when Typhon was brought bound to Isis, this Goddess set him again at liberty; and that when she met her son Horus, he was so indignant at her for having done so, that he knocked the royal crown (*βασίλειον*) from her head. Upon this Hermes presented her with a bull's head for a casque. This story is merely an astronomical allegory. When the Sun sets at Thebes, or indeed in any part of Egypt, with the last degrees of Virgo, which is the constellation of Isis, the Scorpion, which is the constellation of Typhon, is seen at night-fall in the western part of the zodiac pressing on the Balance, and rapidly descending to the horizon, as if pursuing the constellation of Virgo. This gave rise to the fable of Typhon's having pursued Isis through the ravens, who scattered straw behind her. But Isis was also the symbol of the Moon. Now when at this period Isis rejoined Horus, that is, when the Sun and Moon came into conjunction in the constellation of Virgo, the God bereaved the Goddess of her crown; that is, the Lunar crescent, which is the regal ornament of Isis, disappeared of course, when the two luminaries were in conjunction. But Hermes, the guardian of Isis, afterwards presented her with a bull's head for a casque. This was because the next lunar crescent would be seen in the west, in the constellation of Scorpius, at the same time that the head of Taurus was rising in the east. The crescent was frequently symbolised by the horns of a young bull. In the zodiac before us Thoth wears the casque which he afterwards presented to Isis.

DODECATEMORION OF LIBRA.

The figures of the three decans vary little from those which preceded them. In the upper row we find Thoth under the form of a bird with a dog's head. I know not how to account for this symbol. Two female figures follow; and these I take to be Isis and Nephthys. The Balance next appears; and between the scales, enclosed in a circle, and holding as usual his finger to his lip, is seen Harpocrates seated on a throne. This deity indicates the silence of the shades below when the Sun at the autumnal equinox descends to the lower hemisphere.

DODECATEMORION OF SCORPIUS.

The decans in this sign exhibit nothing remarkable. In the upper row four symbolical figures precede the scorpion.

The first is placed in the interior of a circle, and represents Horus bearing the sceptre of a God. The second, a female figure with a dog's head, I conjecture to be Nephtys, the mother of Anubis. The third, likewise a female, I suppose to be Isis. Finally appears Anubis caniform. He stands upright; has the tail of a scorpion; his hands are uplifted; and he wears a mitre on his head. Horus placed in a circle is the symbol of the Sun; and Isis placed between the two caniform figures represents the Moon. Nephtys, or the female κυνοπρόσωπος, with her face averted, indicates the conjunction of the Sun and Moon. Accordingly Horapollon, having described the grief expressed by the male κυνοκέφαλος, ~~which~~ the Moon disappears at her conjunction with the Sun, adds ἡ δὲ θήλεια μετὰ τοῦ μὴ ὄραν, ἀλλὰ ἐν ταῦτά τῳ ἄρσενι πάσχειν, &c. The figure of Anubis, the male cynocephalus, is a little removed from the two females, and denotes that the Moon is now again apparent after her conjunction with the Sun; for Horapollon tells us, that the hieroglyphic for the rising of the Moon, was a cynocephalus standing upright, with his hands raised to heaven, and with a regal ornament on his head. This is precisely the figure before us. Next to the Scorpion, but on the other side, are the figures of a hawk and a serpent. In later times the Egyptians united these two symbols in one, which denoted the Good Geniis. They fabled that as he opened or shut his eyes, light or darkness pervaded the world. (Euseb. l. i. c. 7.)

DODECATEMORION OF SAGITTARIUS.

In the first boat belonging to the decans are three small emblems which I cannot very well distinguish. Above them is the right arm of a man, and a human head perfectly bald. Diodorus Siculus says, that the right hand, with the fingers spread, signifies the supply of life—τῶν δ' ἀκρωτηρίων ἡ μὲν δεξιὰ τοὺς δακτύλους ἐκτεταμένους ἔχουσα σημαίνει βιοῦ περισ-
μόν. I suppose this alludes to the season of sowing the corn, as the husbandman, when he sows the seed, throws wide his hand as he scatters the grain which he had held in it. Certainly the corn was sown in Egypt when the Sun was in Sagittarius. The bald head is probably that of Osiris, which represents the Sun, "shorn of his beams," in the lower hemisphere. The Gods, says Hellanicus Lesbicus, take off their crowns when Typhon reigns.

In the next boat we find a cynocephalus seated.—This

is singularly remarkable. Horapollon tells us that the Egyptians symbolised the two equinoxes by a cynocephalus seated—*Ἰσημερίας δύο δὲ πάλιν σημαίνοντες, κυνοκέφαλον καθήμενον ζωγράφουσι ζῶον*. If then this account be accurate, the symbol in question must have been copied from some very ancient zodiac, when Sagittarius could have been an equinoctial sign. In fact we cannot take a less recent date than the year 700 after the creation, according to the chronology of the LXX. I am fully aware of the difficulty of supposing that the heavens were already examined with attention at so early a period. But perhaps the more we reflect on the subject, the less we shall be disposed to doubt the traditions of the Orientalists.

In the third decan Osiris, or Horus, is represented with a hawk's head.

In the upper row are first seen two female figures, which are probably those of Isis and Nephtys, one symbolising the Moon in the upper hemisphere, and the other symbolising the same luminary when it descends below the horizon.

Next follows Sagittarius *biceps*; and one of his faces is that of a dog. Reference may be here made to the acronical rising of Sirius, which takes place in the Upper Egypt about the time when the Sun sets with the last degrees of Sagittarius. But still it is remarkable, that Sagittarius is *δικέφαλος*. Let us observe that if a zodiac had been formed about seven hundred years after the creation of the world, according to the chronology of the LXX, Virgo and Pisces would have been solstitial, and Gemini and Sagittarius would have been equinoctial signs—or rather, the Sun, at the solstices and equinoxes, would have been retrograding into the adjacent dodecatemoria of Leo, Aquarius, Taurus, and Scorpius. Now it is remarkable, that the four signs, Virgo, Pisces, Gemini, and Sagittarius, appear to have been expressed by double emblems in the most ancient zodiacal monuments—Virgo appears to have been denoted by the head of a woman and the body of a lion—The Fishes are two in number—two figures, the one male, the other female, are found in the ancient monuments of Egypt, in the sign which we call the Twins—and in the same monuments Sagittarius is represented with two faces.

Under the fore-feet of the Centaur (Sagittarius) a serpent is depicted—perhaps to express the cosmical setting of Hydra, which takes place at Thebes while the Sun is in Sagittarius.

DODECATEMORION OF CAPRICORN.

In the middle boat of the decans, a deity appears with the solar disk on his shoulders.

In the upper row two figures, the one male, the other female, are placed next to Sagittarius. The male Divinity, *ἱερακέφαλος*, is armed with an arrow. A singular emblem follows, exhibiting the head of a bull, with only one leg, to which a chain is attached held by another strange figure *ἀγκυρόμορφος*, which is placed next to Capricorn. The two first figures which I have mentioned, I take to be Osiris and Nephtys. The next figure symbolises Taurus; and the last represents Ursa Major, called by the Egyptians the Dog of Typhon. Osiris, who with Nephtys held the place now occupied in our sphere by the Twins, points an arrow at the Bear, or Dog of Typhon; and in our modern globes we find one of the children armed with an arrow, which has no business in his hands. It will be remembered, that when the Sun sets in the first degrees of Capricorn, the Bull, the Bear, and the Twins, are seen above the eastern horizon. But it is possible, that the figure which aims the arrow at the Bear, may be meant for that of Orion. The opposition of Orion to the Bear seems to be noted by Homer, in his description of the shield of Achilles.

DODECATEMORION OF AQUARIUS.

Osiris, or Horus, *ἱερακέφαλος*—Thoth *ἱβικέφαλος*, and a female figure, occupy the three boats of the decans. In the upper row we find Thoth with the head of a bull, Osiris, or Horus, with the head of a hawk, a male Divinity, who holds a kid suspended by the horns, and who must be the same with Mendes, though now converted into the Charioteer. Next appears a man without a head. He is followed by two female figures, probably Isis and Nephtys; and finally is seen Aquarius, pouring water from two small vases. A goose is depicted at the feet of Osiris.

All these whimsical similitudes relate to the constellations. When the Sun sets in Aquarius at Thebes, Cancer is just risen above the horizon; and the hawk appears to have been symbolical of this sign. Accordingly the city just under the tropic of Cancer was named the City of the Hawks, (*ἱεράπολις*), by the Greeks, from the reverence there paid to this bird. Osiris, with the head of a hawk,

may therefore be considered as symbolising the constellation of Cancer. The star of Seth, Soth, or Thoth, in other words the Dog-star, would be likewise seen at the same time at nearly 30 degrees above the horizon. Thoth, who often, it would seem, took the form of an ibis, here represents the star, which was sacred to him, and over which he usually presided in his character of Anubis. Again we find Thoth with the head of a bull, or the casque which he offered to Isis. This seems to argue, that the half-moon was at the meridian, where Taurus was when Aquarius set. The two female figures may have been those of Isis and Nephtys. In the milky way, and near the meridian, would be seen the Charioteer, as we call him, with his kid. What the goose might have to do here seems more questionable. Did the Egyptians represent the constellation, which we call the swan, by a goose? Will the shade of Leda forgive the question? Certainly the goose was sacred to Osiris.

*Ut veniam culpæ non abnuat, anseræ magno,
Scilicet, et tenui popano corruptus Osiris :*

says the malicious Juvenal. Certainly the constellation of the Swan sets acronically in Egypt when the Sun is in Aquarius. Horapollo tells us, that a man without a head was the hieroglyphic by which the Egyptians expressed that a thing could not be done. It is rash then perhaps to attempt to explain this symbol here. But I cannot conceive the man without a head to indicate the Nile. Now it is to be observed, that when the Sun sets in the first degree of Aquarius at Thebes, the whole of the vast constellation of the River, or of the celestial Nile, is visible except the head, where is the great star, vulgarly called Alcanor.

DODECATEMORION OF PISCES.

The decans exhibit nothing remarkable, except that the middle boat contains a figure with the head of a boar. In the upper row Osiris and Isis are placed together. The Fishes, Phagrus and Oxirynchus, are not united by a ligature. A rude representation of water, contained in a quadrangular frame, divides them from each other.

Between this dodecatemorion and that of Aries, a male

figure, standing in the middle of a circle, holds a wild boar by the hind legs. This figure is that of the Egyptian Hercules, much more ancient than the Greek. The fables told by the Greeks of the Erymanthian boar were borrowed from the astronomical allegories of the Orientalists. The constellation of the Bear was denominated that of the Boar by several Asiatic nations. Achilles Tatius was clearly mistaken, when he said that the Egyptians did not know the constellation of the Bear by that name. The reverse may be proved from Diodorus Siculus, from Plutarch, and from ancient Egyptian monuments. But I am inclined to think, that it was also denominated by them the Wild-Boar; and sometimes also the Dog of Typhon. The Bear was the constellation of Typhon; and the Wild-Boar slew Adonis, as Typhon killed Osiris. Diodorus tells us, that as Hercules had engaged to bring the Erymanthian Boar alive to Eurystheus, he took measures, in seizing the animal neither to kill it, nor to be himself wounded by its tusks. In the emblem before us, Hercules is represented as catching the animal by the hind-legs. Now observe. From the time that the Sun enters Sagittarius, the constellation of *Ursa Major* is seen at Thebes approaching, every evening at night-fall, nearer and nearer to the meridian, until the Sun's arrival in the middle of Pisces, when at night-fall, the head of the Bear touches the meridian. At this time the constellation of Hercules is rising immediately under Bootes, in the northern hemisphere, while the stars of the Centaur are rising to the south of the ecliptic. During the same night, and in the same place, the constellation of Hercules will be seen at the meridian, as *Ursa Major* and the Centaur set, one in the northern, the other in the southern hemisphere. The reader will now comprehend the story of the Erymanthian Boar, and the episode of the destruction of the Centaurs by Hercules. The name of Hercules in Egyptian was **XOU**, *Djom*, which means *fortis*; sometimes he was called **XOU HOYT**, *Djom Nout*, *Deus fortis*. But as the Greeks never symbolised any constellation by a wild-boar, and as we see the Egyptians did, we cannot consider the Greeks as the original inventors of the fable concerning the Erymanthian Boar.

DODECATEMORION OF ARIES.

Amoun occupies the boat of the first decan. He is re-

presented with four heads, with the horns of a goat, and the horns of a ram. In one hand he holds the sceptre of a God, and in the other the *crux ansata*. An image of Amoun is thus described by Eusebius :—" This image represents the figure of a man sitting, who is of a cerulean color, and who has the head of a ram. Instead of a crown, he has the horns of a goat, which support a circle resembling a disc. The head of the ram with the horns of a goat, denote the conjunction of the Sun and Moon in the sign of Aries ; and the cerulean color indicates the power of the Moon, greatest during that conjunction, to compel and attract the waters." (Præp. Evang. l. 3.) This passage is remarkable for more reasons than one. But we must proceed. According to La Croze and Jablonski, the *crux ansata*, which was a symbol sacred to Venus, was nothing else than a mystic representation of the phallus. In fact, Amoun, as well as Mendes, indicated the generating power. The triplasian phallus, which is to be seen in the hand of Horus, in the Isiac table, is nothing else than a *crux ansata* with three bars instead of one. Amoun again appears in the second boat. In the third boat we find Harpocrates seated on the lotus-flower. Cuperus considered Harpocrates as the symbol of the rising Sun, and Jablonski maintains that this God was the emblem of the renovated Sun after the winter solstice. Both of these authors may be right, and Harpocrates might have served as a symbol in both the senses which they suggest. But his proper situation is at the two equinoxes, where he is placed in the zodiac before us, when the Sun descends to the lower hemisphere, and when he returns from it. This God indicates to the initiated,

(*Quippe premit vocem, digitoque silentia suadet,*)

that those who descend to the regions below, and those who return from them, must be silent, nor reveal the mysteries which they have witnessed. In the Greek zodiacs, at least if we can judge from the copies, Aries was represented as lying on his right side, and as presenting to us the left. In the zodiac before us, the Ram is represented as running, and as turning his right side to the spectator.

DODECATEMORION OF TAURUS.

In the first decan we find Harpocrates seated on the

lotus. On his head is placed a crescent, the concave part turned from the head, and containing a disc. This symbol indicates the Moon's crescent immediately before her conjunction with the Sun. The two next decans are represented by Osiris and Horus. In the row above the decans, a very singular emblem presents itself. A bear and a kid are placed upright, and back to back. A hawk is seen over the head of the bear. This must have been imagined, because in the south of Egypt the great star *Dubeh*, or *Dibeh*, which is placed on the back of the Bear, and the great star which is placed on the back of the Kid, or Goat, in our ancient globes, rise cosmically with Taurus. Behind the Bull stands Osiris *biceps*—the two heads are those of a hawk. The figure of the Bull resembles that of the Bull, which the Indians represented as breaking with his horns the mundane egg. (See Maurice's Indian Antiquities.)

DODECATEMORION OF GEMINI.

I observe that Anubis occupies one of the boats in the lower row. M. Visconti was therefore mistaken in saying, that the symbol of *Canis Major* was to be found in the dodecatemorion of Cancer.

The constellation which we call the Twins, is represented by a male and by a female figure. The latter wears the mask of Anubis. I conceive these figures to be those of Osiris and Nephtys.

The very frequent recurrence of the hawk's head in this zodiac is remarkable. The hawk seems to have been peculiarly the symbol of the Sun, and especially in the sign of Cancer. When flying, this bird was the symbol of the wind, and probably of the north wind, because it comes with the Etesian wind to Egypt. But the hawk seems to have been the symbol of the vivifying power of the Sun. Horapollon says, that this bird typified the soul, and that its name was composed of *Bai*, which signified *the soul*, and *eth*, which signified *the heart*. It is probable, that the Egyptians considered the hawk as the symbol of animal life produced by the heat of the solar rays; or perhaps simply the vivifying power of the Sun. Abenephlius expresses this sentiment more energetically, when he says the Egyptians symbolised by the hawk, *ال تغش لل شمس*, *the soul of the Sun*.

There is one remarkable circumstance in this zodiac. I mean the positions of the Bull and of the Ram. The Bull presents his left side to us, and the Ram his right side. Now if attention be paid to this circumstance, it will seem to indicate, that when the great zodiac of Dendera was constructed, the Sun's place at the vernal equinox was between the Ram and the Bull, that is, between the figures of these two constellations. The most eastern star in the proper constellation of Aries has now its longitude about $1^{\circ} 20'$: but we may suppose, that precise exactness was not sought for, and indeed it could not be easily expressed, by the framers of the zodiac. We may, therefore, reckon the Sun's right ascension at the time of the vernal equinox to have been then about the middle of the sign of Taurus, according to the fixed zodiac.

The inequality of dimensions among the figures which represent the 12 zodiacal constellations, was apparently caused by the symbols introduced in unequal numbers into each sign by the Egyptians. These symbols represented different stars and asterisms, or rather the deities which presided over them.

In writing this Memoir, I have paid no attention to the relative sizes and positions of the figures which represent the zodiacal constellations on our ancient globes; and by the term zodiacal constellations, I have generally understood the whole dodecatemoron, to which each principal figure in it properly belongs. I have also used this expression to denote, that I was speaking of the signs according to their real positions in the heavens, and not according to the fixed zodiac of the Greeks.

I observe, that in the new English celestial globes, the figures of the animals are no longer represented. The reason for this change it would be difficult to guess. Were there any grown-up children who were afraid of the wild beasts?

I have yet a few observations to make. It may perhaps be thought, that I have too much depreciated the character of the Greeks as mathematicians and astronomers. In this respect, I certainly consider them as inferior to the ancient Indians, Chaldeans, and Egyptians; but they had the merit of collecting and preserving many fragments of that great system of science which once existed, and of building out

of them a goodly fabric for themselves; nor can I bring myself to conclude this Memoir, without paying to the Greeks the tribute of admiration, which I think to be so justly their due. They were the first people who taught the principles, and who enjoyed the blessings, of liberty, not merely civil, but moral and religious. If these blessings were sometimes abused—if liberty among the Greeks sometimes degenerated into licence, it only proves the proneness of man to turn good into evil, and to pervert the best principles of his nature to unworthy ends. The fine arts owe their existence to the Greeks. Poetry had its origin with the Orientalists; but with the Greeks it became an art. The Indians indeed boast of poets as ancient as Homer, and of poems as perfect as the *Iliad*; but it will be long before they convince strangers of the justice of their pretensions; nor will the few admirers of Shanscrit literature easily persuade us to transfer our admiration from the Muses of Greece to the *Gopis* of India. No poetical machinery can be imagined more beautiful and more sublime, than that invented by the Greeks; and after being acquainted with their elegant and allegorical mythology, who can easily suffer the monstrous fictions and extravagant fables of the Hindu mythologists? We feel all the effects of the *sublime idéal*, when the visage of the God of day becomes dark with ire, and when he advances towards the Grecian camp, *ἔοικε ὡς νύκτι*, “like to the night;” nor are we less struck with awe, when Olympus trembles at the nod of Jove. But the monstrous forms of Vishnu, Indra, Mahadera, and Cali, present themselves to our imaginations like the capricious and hideous phantoms of a feverish dream. We read the story of Rama, or of Crishnu, as we would read a fairy tale; with this difference only, that we are not amused. The harp of the Hebrews could alone, in those ancient days, excel the lyre of the Greeks; but its tones were sublime, and its strings vibrated to the touch of hands, that trembled with holy raptures, and that shook under the impulses of more than human inspiration. Oriental poetry has often been faulty, from the excess of its glittering ornaments, and from its want of clearness and method. In force and energy it is pre-eminent. It may be compared to a torrent, of which the surface is sparkling with sun-beams, but of which the waters are not always clear and limpid. Grecian eloquence flows from a clearer source. It is still to the poets,

the orators, and the historians of Greece, that we look for models of excellence. Nor were the sister arts neglected. With Poetry and Eloquence flourished Music, Painting, Sculpture, and Architecture. In Greece, Philosophy was first generally honored, because it was there she first spoke a language generally intelligible to mankind; and no where can we find more sagacity employed, more acuteness displayed, or more intellect exercised, than in the schools of Athens. It is there that we may admire the happy influence of that liberal spirit which existed among the Greeks, and which is but too little known among ourselves. The disciple of the New Academy could live in peace with the Old—the Peripatetic with the Epicurean—and the Stoic with the Pyrrhonist. Difference of opinion might then, as now, occasionally blaze out into personal quarrel; but in those times no standard of philosophy was set up, which might serve as a pretext to excuse secret malice, and to justify public calumnies. The philosophers of Greece stood in awe of no tribunal but of that of Reason. If one example be found in contradiction to these remarks—if Socrates perished by the hemlock, let it be remembered, that he was neither hated by the virtuous, nor persecuted by the learned.

Ancient Egypt presents us with a far different scene. There every thing was diminutive, or gigantic—contemptible for its meanness and littleness, or stupendous from its majesty and grandeur. No medium was apparently known between the highest elevation of intellect, and its lowest degradation; nor is it easy to imagine a more singular contrast, than existed between the learning of the Priests and the ignorance of the People. •

It was long my wish to examine with my own eyes the monuments of which I have been speaking; but already descending into the vale of years, I must trust to the reports of others, and be satisfied with the accounts of younger or of bolder travellers. Still, I think, during the term of life which it shall yet please God to grant to me, I shall always take a deep interest in all that relates to ancient Egypt—that land of mystery, which was the cradle of the sciences, and which, but for the Greeks, had been their tomb.

OBSERVATIONS ON

PROFESSOR COUSIN'S Edition of the COMMENTARIES of PROCLUS on the First Alcibiades of Plato, in 2 Vols. 8vo. Paris, 1820 and 1821; and also on CREUZER'S Edition of the same COMMENTARIES, together with those of Olympiodorus on that Dialogue, in 2 Vols. 8vo. Francof. 1820 and 1821.

No. II.—[Concluded from No. ALIX.]

P. 155 of Creuzer, *Ἐπρεπε γὰρ τῷ μαιευτικῷ καὶ κριτῇ τῶν τε γονιμῶν λόγων καὶ τῶν ἀναμιαίων πρὸς τὸ μαιευόμενον, οὗτος ὁ τρόπος τῆς διαίτησεως.* In this passage for *καὶ κριτῇ* the Harleian Ms. has *τῷ κριτῇ*, and so likewise has Cousin p. 319. But for *ἀναμιαίων* which has no signification, Creuzer very properly substitutes *ἀνεμιαίων*, which is also the reading of Cousin. P. 161 of Creuzer, *καὶ τὸ θεῶν αὐτὸν ἐπονομαζεσθαι ὑπὲρ ταύτην αὐτῷ ταξίν ἐν τῷ γενεῖ τῶν δαιμονῶν μαρτυρεῖ.* But for *ὑπὲρ ταύτην*, the Harl. Ms. has *ὑπερτατήν*, and so likewise has Cousin p. 328, which is doubtless the true reading. For then Proclus will say what he had before said in these Commentaries, “that Socrates by calling his daemon a God, testifies that this daemon has the highest order in the genus of daemons.” Again, in Creuzer p. 172, *καὶ ἀναπεραντὰς πάλιν ἐν τούτοις ὁ Ἀλκιβιάδης ὁ τοῖς φίλοις πασι τοῖς ἀρίστοις χρωμένος νυνὶ Σωκράτους ὑπηρετῆς.* But the Harl. Ms. for *ἀρίστοις* has rightly *ἀορίστους*, and also very properly adds *ὑπηρεταῖς*. Cousin likewise, tom. III, adds this word, but then he has *ἀρίστοις ὑπηρεταῖς*, which is erroneous. For Socrates was the best friend of Alcibiades; all his other friends being of an indefinite description. Creuzer p. 176, *Ὁ ἀρὰ ἀγαθὸς συμβούλος, εἰπερ ἐπιστημῶν ἐστὶν ἐν οἷς ἀν οἱ συμβουλευόμενοι ἀνεπιστημονες, ἡ ἐμαθε ταῦτα, ἡ ἐπιστάται, ἡ εὖρε.* But the Harl. Ms. has rightly *ἀ ἐπιστάται* for *ἡ ἐπιστάται*, and so likewise has Cousin, p. 14. Again, in p. 187 of Creuzer, and p. 29 and 30 of Cousin, Proclus having observed that the human soul, though she contains all reason [i. e. participations of divine forms or ideas] in herself, yet in consequence of being darkened through generation, in the survey of the forms she possesses, requires discipline and invention, in order that through the former she may excite her inherent intellections, but through the latter may discover herself, and the plenitude of forms she contains: he then adds, *Καὶ ἐστὶ ταῦτα τὰ διὸρα θεῶν ἐνεργεστῶντων αὐτὴν περυστῶν, καὶ*

επανακαλουμένων εις την νοεραν ζωνην· ἀμφω μὲν γὰρ ἐκ τῆς Ἑρμαϊκῆς
 κλοντα ταξέως, ἀλλ' ἡ μὲν καθόσον ἐστὶν ὁ θεὸς οὗτος Μαιας, τῆς Ἀτ-
 λαντος, υἱος, ἡ δὲ καθόσον ἐστὶν ἀγγέλως τοῦ Διὸς. Ἐκφαίνων μὲν
 γὰρ τὴν πατρικὴν βουλήσιν ἐνδίδωσι ταῖς ψυχαῖς· ἐκ δὲ τῆς Μαιας
 προΐων, παρ' ἡ κρυφίως ἡ ζήτησις, τὴν εὐρεσιν δαρείται τοῖς ἐαυτοῦ τρο-
 φίμοις. This is also the reading of the Harl. Ms. But after
 ἐνδίδωσι ταῖς ψυχαῖς, it is necessary to add τὴν μάθησιν. For
 Proclus having before observed, that both *discipline* and *inven-*
tion (ἡ μάθησις καὶ ἡ εὐρεσις) proceed from the Hermaic order,
 now adds, “that one of these gifts is imparted by him, so far
 as he is the son of Maia, but the other, so far as he is the mes-
 senger of Jupiter. For as unfolding the paternal will, he im-
 parts to souls *discipline*, but as proceeding from Maia, who
 occultly contains in herself *investigation*, he imparts *invention*
 to those who are under his guardian care.” In p. 189 of Creu-
 zer, and p. 31 of Cousin, Proclus, speaking of twofold igno-
 rance, (ἑπλη ἀγνοία,) or that condition of the soul in which he
 who is ignorant does not know that he is ignorant, and which is
 the disease of the multitude, observes that through this, as Dio-
 tima says in the Banquet of Plato, that which is neither beau-
 tiful, nor good, nor wise, is fancied to be sufficient. And he
 then adds, Τὸ δὲ αἰτιον, ὅτι κατελθούσαι εἰς γενετὴν αἱ ψυχαὶ πλη-
 ρεῖς κατ' οὐσίαν τῶν ἐπιστημῶν ὑπαρχούσαι, τὴν ἐκ τῆς γενεσεως
 ληθην εἰσδεχονται, καὶ τὸ μὴ εἶναι τοὺς λόγους τῶν πραγμάτων οἷον
 σφύζοντας, ἐννοίας εἰχουσι περὶ αὐτῶν, τῷ δὲ τῆς λήθης ποματι κρα-
 τουμεναι διαρθρύν τας ἐαυτῶν ἀδυνατούσιν ἐννοίας καὶ εἰς ἐπιστημὴν
 ἀναπεμπειν. This too is the reading of the Harl. Ms. But
 for τὸ μὴ εἶναι τοὺς λόγους, it is necessary to read τῷ μὲν εἶναι
 τοὺς λόγους. For the human soul through the oblivion arising
 from generation, or her connection with a flowing condition of
 being, has the reasons or forms of things in a palpitating, and
 scarcely breathing condition; but in consequence of being van-
 quished by the potion of Oblivion, she is incapable of giving a
 distinct subsistence to her conceptions, and referring them to
 science. And in the same page of Creuzer, and p. 32 of Cou-
 sin, Proclus observes, concerning matter and divinity, Ὡς γὰρ
 ἡ οὐλὴ ἀνείδεος, καὶ ὁ θεὸς· καὶ δὴ καὶ ἀπείρον ἐκατέραν καὶ ἀγνώστον,
 εἰ καὶ παντὰ, ὁ μὲν κατὰ τὸ κρείττον, ἡ δὲ κατὰ τὸ χεῖρον. Thus
 too the Harl. Ms. But for εἰ καὶ παντὰ, I read εἰ καὶ παντῇ.
 And then what Proclus says will be in English, “For as matter
 is formless, so likewise is God. Each also is infinite and un-
 known, though the latter is *entirely* so, according to that which
 is more excellent, but the former according to that which has a
 more deteriorated subsistence.”

Again, in p. 197 of Creuzer, and p. 41 of Cousin, Proclus, speaking of the Athenian pipe, says, *Και γαρ τα παναερμονια και η πολυχорδια μιμηματα των αυλων εστιν· εκαστον γαρ τρυπημα των αυλων τρεις φθογγους, (Harl. τριφθογγους,) ως φασι, τουλαχιστον αφησιν· ει δε και τα παρατρυπηματα ανοιχθειη, πλειους.* In this passage, after *παρατρυπηματα* the Harl. Ms. adds *των αυλων.* Creuzer well observes in his Notes, “*Et est hic locus insignis ad explicandam tibiæ rationem, quæ apud veteres invaluetur.*” I add, that Isaac Vossius, in his excellent treatise *De Poematum Cantu, et Viribus Rythmi*, (p. 110) quotes and illustrates this passage of Proclus. In p. 212 of Creuzer, and p. 60 of Cousin, for *της περιττης οησεως* in the following passage, *Μετα την καθαρσιν τοιουν της περιττης οησεως παρακελευεσθαι τω νεανισκω σκοπειν και ανεγειρειν εαυτον κ. τ. λ.,* the Harl. Ms. has *την περι της οησεως*, which is doubtless the true reading. For as *οησις* always signifies in the philosophy of Plato, *distorted opinion*, it cannot be supposed that Proclus would use the expression *περιττη οησις*. For *νομον* in p. 219. l. 19 of Creuzer, and p. 69. l. 21 of Cousin, the Harl. Ms. has rightly *νομιμον*. In p. 231 of Creuzer, and p. 84 of Cousin, Proclus says, *ως γαρ του θεου παντα αμεριστως ποιουντος η υλη δεχεται μεν εις εαυτην, κ. τ. λ.* and this is likewise the reading of the Harl. Ms. But after *δεχεται*, it is necessary to add *μεριστως*. For then Proclus will say what he frequently and most truly asserts, that God produces all things *impartibly*, but that matter receives *partibly*, what he produces.

In p. 234 of Creuzer, and p. 89 of Cousin, Proclus, in commenting on the words of Socrates, *Ου μα τον φιλιον τον εμον τε και σου, ον εγω ηκιστα επωρησμαι*, having shown that the *φιλιος θεος* is Jupiter, observes, *ηκιστα γαρ αν επιορηκσειε τον φιλιον εν τοις προς Αλκιβιαδην λογοις, ηκιστα δ' αν τον ξενιον εν τοις προς τον ξερον, και τον ικεσιον εν τοις προς τον ικετην.* The Harl. Ms. for *δ' αν τον ξενιον*, has *διαν τον ξενιον*. But this is evidently corrupt. For it should be *Δια τον ξενιον*, which is doubtless the true reading. In p. 236 of Creuzer, and p. 91 of Cousin, Proclus, alluding to what Diotima in the Banquet of Plato says about the origin of Love, observes as follows: *Η μεν ουν πενια η εν' ημιν αιτια της αποριας εστι και ερωσ επι την ζητησιν εγειρει της τελειας γνωσεως· ο δε πορος εν τω οντι και της ψυχης Μητιδος ων υιος. Ανωθεν γαρ προεισι το ουσιωδες ημων απο του θειου νου, το δε δυναμιε το εν ημιν η πενια και η ανριστηια της ζωης.* This too is the reading of the Harl. Ms. But for *εν τω οντι*, I read *εν τω ουσιωδει*. And as something appears to be wanting in *και της ψυχης*, both according to the Mss. of Creuzer and Cousin, I add after *και* the words *τη νοερα φυσει*. In the words, *Οτε μεν γαρ περι των καθ' υλον τους*

λογους ετοιμειτο, τη επιστημη μονη προς την ληψιν εχρητο της αληθειας, p. 238 of Creuzer, the Harl. Ms. has rightly for καθ' ολον, καθολου, and so likewise has Cousin, p. 94. Again, in p. 243 of Creuzer, Proclus observes, Ενταυθα δη ουν ο Σωκρατης, ωσπερ τις Ηρακλης τας της υβρας κεφαλας εκτεμνων, δεικνυσιν, οτι ου παν το πληθος αξιοπιστον εστι περι την γνωσιν των τε δικαιων και των αδικων. The Harl. Ms. for οτι ου παν το πληθος κ. τ. λ., has erroneously οτι παν το πληθος, and the reading of Creuzer is not correct. For according to Plato, the multitude are *universally* unworthy of belief with respect to the knowledge of what is just and what is unjust. I therefore conceive that the reading of Cousin, p. 104, οτι παν το πληθος αναξιπιστον εστι κ. τ. λ., is perfectly accurate. In p. 247 of Creuzer, and p. 105 of Cousin, Proclus having observed that science is not the summit of knowledge, but that intellect is prior to it, adds, ου λεγω τον εξηρημενον της ψυχης νουν, αλλ' αυτην την εκειθεν ελλαμψιν την εφηκουσαν τη ψυχη κ. τ. λ. And this is also the reading of the Harl. Ms. But instead of ου λεγω, it is requisite to read ου μονον λεγω. And Ficinus evidently found μονον in his Ms.; for his version of this passage is, "non intellectum inquam duntaxat ab anima separatum."

Again, in p. 247 of Creuzer, and p. 105 of Cousin, Proclus observes: Ως γαρ νου μετεχομεν κατα τον ειρημενον νουν, ουτω και του πρωτου, παρ' ου πασιν η γνωσις κατα το εν και οιον ανθος της ουσιας ημων, καθ' ο και μαλιστα τω θεω συνανπομεθα. This too is the reading of the Harl. Ms. But for η γνωσις, it is necessary to read η ενωσις. For as all knowledge proceeds from the *first intellect*, so all *union* proceeds from *the one*, or the great first principle of all things. Ficinus also appears to have had ενωσις and not γνωσις in his Ms. For he thus translates this passage: "Quemadmodum enim per intellectum nostrum divinum tangimus intellectum, sic et primum unum, a quo omnibus inest uno per unum, et tanquam essentie nostrae florem attingere licet; per quod sane nostrum unum divino maxime jungimur." P. 152 of Creuzer, and p. 110 of Cousin: Ταυτα μεν ουν περι του παντος ημιν ειρησθα συλλογισμου, την δια παντων διηκουσαν ωφελειαν απ' αυτου καταδησαμενοις. In this passage the Harl. Ms. for καταδησαμενοις has καταστησαμενοις, which I have no doubt is the true reading. In the following passage, p. 258 of Creuzer, and p. 118 of Cousin, Ωσπερ γαρ ου δει θαυμαζειν ει εν τω Ταρταρω ψυχας κολαζομενας ιδοιμεν (τουτων γαρ ην ο εκει τοπος), the Harl. Ms. for ο εκει τοπος has οικειος τοπος; but perhaps the true reading will be οικειος ο εκει τοπος. In p. 259 of Creuzer, and p. 120 of Cousin, there is a lacunula in the following passage, Επει και ο Πυθαγορας των μεν οντων παντων σοφωτατον εινα ειλεγε τον αριθμον, δευτερον δ.

εις σοφίαν το τοις πραγμασι τα οἰκονομα τινειναι τα προσηκοντα· το μεν γαρ εστιν ο πρωτος αριθμος, ψυχη δε νοερα μετα τουτον η των ειδων θεωρητικη, το δε εν και προ ψυχης και προ νου· γενηναι γαρ τον. Creuzer conjectures that the word αριθμον is wanting; but it appears to me that the deficiency will be accurately supplied by the words νουν και την ψυχην. In the following passage in p. 304 of Creuzer, viz. Ὡσπερ. ουν οι ιατροι καθαιρουσι προτερον και τον ενοχλουντα χυμον καθαιρουσι φαρμακειαις, επειθ' ουτως ανακτωνται τας δυναμεις διαιταις κ. τ. λ. the Harl. Ms. for καθαιρουσι φαρμακειαις, has rightly εκβαλλουσι φαρμακειαις, and so likewise has Cousin, p. 181. In p. 308 of Creuzer, for ταυτων in the words Τριων δ' ουν οντων ταυτων δεικνυσιν κ. τ. λ., the Harl. Ms. has rightly τουτων, and so also has Cousin, p. 188. In p. 310 of Creuzer, and p. 190 of Cousin, the Harl. Ms. for των θεων την Πειθω in the following passage, Εικοτως· αρα και οι τα θεια σοφοι των της επιστημης χορηγω των θεων την Πειθω συνοικιζουσι, has rightly των θεων την Πειθω. In p. 314 of Creuzer, l. 2, and p. 195, l. 5, of Cousin, for δειχθεντος, the Harl. Ms. has λεχθεντος. And in p. 315 of Creuzer, l. 17, and p. 197, l. 12, of Cousin, for προς την ανθρωπινην ευδαιμονιαν, the Harl. Ms. has προς την ανθρωπινης ζωης ευδαιμονιαν. In p. 328 of Creuzer, and p. 215 of Cousin, Proclus, speaking of beauty, says, Ετοιμως, ειτε δια το καλειν εις εαυτο κεκληται, ειτε δια το κινειν και θελγειν τα προς αυτα δυναμενα βλεπειν εραστον εστι κατα φυσιν. But the Harl. Ms. for το κινειν has το κηλειν. And Ficinus had this word also in his Ms., as is evident from his version, "Re enim vera καλον, id est pulchrum, sive dicitur δια το καλειν, id est quia provocat animas, sive δια το κηλειν, id est quia permulcet intuentes, certe secundum naturam est amabile."

Again, in p. 330 and 331 of Creuzer, Proclus observes Ἀλην γαρ, οτι προς μεν τον το καθολου αποφασκοντα και το μερικον καταφασκον αρκει κατασκευασαι, προς δε τον της μερικης αποφασεως προϊσταμενον αναγκη το καθ' ολου κατασκευαζειν καταφατικον· ο δη και ποιησει ο Σωκρατης λαβων, οτι το συμφερον ου καθ' ολου ου παντων αποφασκει των δικαιων, αλλα τινων μονον. In this passage, where καθ' ολου occurs in two places, the Harl. Ms. has rightly καθολου, and so likewise has Cousin, p. 219. But instead of ου παντων αποφασκει κ. τ. λ., which is also the reading of the Harl. Ms., it is necessary to read παντων αποφασκει, without the ου. For then Proclus will say, "that Alcibiades did not deny the profitable of all just things, but only of some," which is doubtless his true meaning.

Lastly, Cousin, p. 277, in a note at the end of the Epitome by Ficinus of these Commentaries, observes as follows: "Hic

finis omnium quos novimus Codicum. Sequentia sunt quæ Cod. Ambros. 285. ait a Ficino ex his Procli Commentariis Latine versa. Vid. p. 250. Quo autem de Codice versa fuerint, plane ignoro; adulterinaque an vera, Procli an alterius existimanda sint, alias inquiretur." The sequentia, of which Cousin here speaks, consist of a Latin version of a treatise ascribed to Proclus, *De Sacrificio et Magia*; and I am pleased to find that a conjecture of mine respecting this little work, made by me seventeen years ago, is strengthened by the authority of the Ambrosian Ms. For in Vol. i. of my translation of Plato, p. 63, I have given a translation in English of this treatise, in a note on the following passage from the First Alcibiades: *ων ο μιν μαγειαν τε διδασκει την Ζωροαστρου του Νρομαζου· εστι δε τουτο θεων θεραπεια.* And I there observe: "The following account of Magic by Proclus, originally formed, as it appears to me, a part of the Commentary written by him on the present passage. For the Ms. Commentary of Proclus, which is extant on this Dialogue, does not extend to more than a third part of it; and this Dissertation on Magic, which is only extant in Latin, was published by Ficinus the translator, immediately after his Excerpta from this Commentary. So that it seems highly probable, that the Ms. from which Ficinus translated his Excerpta, was much more perfect than those which are now extant, in consequence of containing this account of the Magic of the ancients."

The lovers of the philosophy of Plato will, I am sure, unite with me in ardently hoping that Professor Cousin will publish as soon as possible the remaining books of Proclus on the Parmenides of Plato, and Creuzer his edition of the Works of Plotinus, in the preparation of which for the Press I understand he is at present engaged. For all genuine Platonists will doubtless say to each of these learned men, what Plotinus said to Porphyry, from the *Iliad*,¹

Βαλλ' ουτως, αικεν τι φως ανδρεσσι γενηαι.

"Thus write, and you'll illuminate mankind."

T.

¹ Lib. Θ. v. 282. But Plotinus, in applying this verse to Porphyry, substituted *ανδρεσσι* for *Δαναοισι*.

DUBLIN PRIZE ESSAY.

On the Analogy of Poetry and Painting.

“ Ut pictura, poësis — ”

Μιμητικὴ τέχνη καὶ δυνάμεις ἐστὶ ἀντίστροφος τῇ ζωγραφίᾳ. — Ζωγραφίαν εἶναι φθεγγομένην τῇ ποιήσιν — ποιήσιν δὲ σιγᾶσαν τὴν ζωγραφίαν.
Vetus auct. apud Plutar.

It has ever been a favorite employment, as well with the Metaphysician as with the Poet, to trace the Liberal Arts to a common source.

Whilst the one, in analysing the human mind, has endeavoured to discover some common principle from which they all flow; the other has been content with the less arduous, though not less pleasing, task of personifying them as sisters.

Of these, no two (if we leave Sculpture out of the question) bear a stronger mutual resemblance than the arts of Poetry and Painting.

At first sight, indeed, we may be struck with many and considerable differences between them.—Thus Poetry, compared with Painting, is found to possess much more extensive means of operation: it is restricted in the exercise of its powers by unity neither of time nor of place; the past, the present, and the future, being all equally at its service, whilst it can shift the scene of action as often as variety may require. Poetry leads us on step by step, excites in the mind a growing interest, and enslaves us, almost insensibly, by a successive display of its charms. Thus it can take up its hero when a child; gradually interest us in his fate; excite our curiosity; keep us in a state of breathless expectation and suspense; and finally astonish and overwhelm us with an unforeseen catastrophe.

In all these respects, Painting is much more circumscribed. A picture can with propriety contain but one subject or action, and is confined, in the representation of this action, to a single point of time. Its connexion with past or future is, at best, equivocal. It has, therefore, no oppor-

tunity of insinuating itself into our favor, or of gradually preparing the mind, and winding it up to the desired pitch. Whatever it would do, must be done at once—must be effected at a single blow. In Painting too, as the whole of a composition is exposed without any reserve to our first glance, curiosity, the steady auxiliary of Poetry, is gratified at the very outset, and, like a treacherous ally, deserts us in the hour of need.

Still, notwithstanding all these strong marked differences, we shall find that Poetry and Painting possess points of coincidence sufficiently numerous and striking, to account for their having been considered in all ages as kindred arts.

A slight investigation will show us that both are founded on the same basis;—that the effects which they aim at producing are for the most part the same; that they pursue similar means of exciting interest and keeping up attention; and lastly, that the very errors, into which they may be betrayed, often possess a striking analogy.

I. The arts of Poetry and Painting are founded on Imitation.

The assertion is, at the least, as old as the days of Aristotle; but this, happily, is not the age for receiving, blindly and without examination, the dogmata of antiquity, even though supported by the authority of the Stagirite himself. Accordingly we find that many writers both on Poetry and Painting have endeavoured to controvert that position.

It is not an imitation of Nature, say they, which the greatest poets and the greatest painters have presented to us; it is something far more perfect—more spiritual—something which never existed, save in idea, till drawn forth and embodied by their creative genius. Who, they triumphantly exclaim,—borrowing an illustration from a kindred art,—who ever saw the majestic symmetry of the *Apollo*, or the feminine grace of the *Venus*, realised on earth?

That so much perfection was never found combined in any one individual, we cannot for a moment deny: yet, on the other hand, that all the component parts of those masterpieces of art are consonant to nature, is evident from this—that the highest praise, which it is possible to bestow upon them, is to say—they are natural.

If we analyse the means, by which the Artist and the Poet arrive even at their noblest conceptions, we shall find that it is by a careful perusal of nature; by selecting such of her works as approach nearest to perfection; by abs-

tracting their beauties; in short, by imitating and combining the most excellent parts of her best productions.¹

Thus, though the abstract idea in the mind of genius be the immediate prototype of all that is grand or beautiful in the fine arts, Nature is the original model. To imitate her has ever been the great business both of the Poet and of the Painter; and accordingly we find that those who have done so best have excited in mankind at once the strongest and the most lasting admiration. It is this, in a great degree, which has raised so high the fame of M. Angelo;²—this which has bestowed immortality on the Bard of Avon.³

The Poet, as well as the Painter, should first make himself familiar with Nature in the detail; then abstract and generalise; and lastly, when his mind is sufficiently stored with materials, select and combine, and thus “try to produce something superior to common nature, though borrowed from it.”⁴

Having thus endeavoured to prove that these arts rest on the same foundation, let us next proceed to investigate their objects, and to discover whether with regard to these too, they do not in a great measure coincide.

II. The sublime, the beautiful, and the pathetic, are

¹ In support of this opinion, as far as it regards Painting, the following quotations from two of the best writers on the subject will suffice:

“A painter ought to study universal nature, and reason much within himself on all he sees, making use of the most excellent parts that compose the species of every object before him.”—*Leonardo da Vinci*, chap. 360.

“It is in nature only we can find that beauty which is the great object of our search; it can be found no where else; we can no more form any idea of beauty superior to nature, than we can form an idea of a sixth sense, or any other excellence out of the limits of the human mind. We are forced to confine our conceptions even of Heaven itself and its inhabitants, to what we see in this world.” *Sir Joshua Reynolds*.

² The works of this great painter and statuary are said almost to rival antiquity in the accurate knowledge of Nature which they display.

In Dryden's preface to Du Fresnoy's *Art of Painting*, we find the following remarkable words: “In our times Michael Angelo was esteemed *too natural*”;—“He drew persons as they were.” Could he have built his fame on a better foundation? The high estimation in which he has now so long been held, would lead us to think *not*.

³ Shakspeare's distinguishing excellence has been beautifully expressed by Milton in the following couplet:

“And sweetest Shakspeare, Nature's child,
Warbles his native wood-notes wild.”

The following words from an old Greek Author, are highly characteristic of this bewitching poet. *Τῆς φύσεως γραμματεὺς ἦν, τὴν κἀλαμὸν ἀποβλέπων εἰς νοῦν*. This peculiar charm could not be more happily expressed.

⁴ Anonymous Letter to Barry. *Barry's Works*, Vol. i. p. 265.

equally the objects, and are, indeed, the principal objects, of both these arts.

To be convinced of this, we have only to examine the master-pieces of the Painter and the Poet, which will be found, with only a few exceptions,¹ calculated either to excite sensations of sublimity or beauty; or to rouse the dormant sympathies of our nature by the representation of imaginary distress.

To attain the true sublime is probably one of the highest efforts of which the human mind is capable, and has consequently ever been one of the noblest objects of ambition as well with the painter as the poet. Yet so difficult is it to reach this high and proud pre-eminence, that very few of either class have had their labors crowned with success; the painter too often mistaking an irregular vastness and deformity² for sublimity and grandeur of conception; whilst the poet not less frequently runs off into swollen and turgid expressions, "*ampullas et sesquipedalia verba*," better calculated to excite our laughter than to fill us with astonishment or awe; so much of truth is there in the common assertion, that from the *sublime* to the *ridiculous* there is but a step.

Lucan furnishes us with more instances of this false sublime than almost any other Poet. In his *Pharsalia*, at the very setting out, we find him describing the progress and effects of the civil war in the following pompous terms:

Fert animus causas tantarum expromere rerum :
Imensumque aperitur opus, quid in arma furentem
Impulerit populum, quid pacem excusserit orbi.
Invida fatorum series, summisque negatum
Stare diu ; nimioque graves sub pondere lapsus,
Nec se Roma ferens. Sic, cum, compage soluta,
Secula tot mundi suprema coegerit hora,
Antiquum repetent iterum chaos omnia ; mixtis
Sidera sideribus concurrent : ignea pontum
Astra petent : tellus extendere littora nolet,
Excutietque fretum : fratri contraria Phoebe

¹ The satirical and the ludicrous style in poetry; caricature and the representation of very low life in painting, are the chief exceptions. But these are very inferior departments in their respective arts. The analogy, however, is still obvious.

² "The representation of gigantic and monstrous figures has nothing of sublimity either in Poetry or Painting, which depends entirely on expression."—*Anonymous Letter to Barry*.

Ibit, et, obliquum bigas agitare per orbem
 Indignata, diem poscet sibi : totaque discors
 Machina divulsi turbabit foedera mundi. L. i. 67.

To render his peculiarities still more striking, we have only to compare him with the majestic simplicity of Homer. A tempest at sea is probably one of the grandest scenes in Nature, and is admirably suited to suggest sublime and splendid imagery.

Lucan describes one at great length in the fifth book of his *Pharsalia*, and Homer in the fifth of the *Odyssey*. The following extracts from each will sufficiently enable us to judge of their respective styles.

Tunc quoque tanta maris moles crevisset in astra,
 Ni Superum rector pressisset nubibus undas.
 Non coeli nox illa fuit : latet obsitus aër
 Infernae pallore domus, nimisque gravatus
 Deprimitur, fluctusque in nubibus accipit imbrem.
 Lux etiam metuenda perit, nec fulgura currunt
 Clara, sed obscurum nimbosus dissilit aër.
 Tunc Superum convexa tremunt, atque arduus axis
 Intonuit, motaque poli compage laborant.
 Extimuit Natura chaos : rupisse videntur
 Concordes elementa moras, rursusque redire
 Nox, manes mixtura Deis : spes una salutis,
 Quod tanta mundi nondum periire ruina.
 Quantum Leucadio placidus de vertice pontus
 Despicitur, tantum nautæ videre trementes
 Fluctibus a summis præceps mare ; cumque tumentes
 Rursus hiant undæ, vix eminent æquore malus.
 Nubila tanguntur velis, et terra carina.
 Nam pelagus, qua parte sedet, non celat arenas
 Exhaustum in cumulos, omnisque in fluctibus unda est.
 Artis opem vicere metus : nescitque magister
 Quam frangat, cui cedat aquæ.¹ L. v. 625.

Ὡς εἰπὼν, συναγεν νεφέλας, ἐτάραξε δὲ πόντον,
 Χερσὶ τρίαιναν ἐλών· πάσας δ' ὀρόθυγεν ἀέλλας
 Παντοίων ἀνέμων· σὺν δὲ νεφέεσσι κάλυψε
 Γαῖαν ὁμοῦ καὶ πόντον· ὀρώρει δ' οὐρανόθεν νύξ.

¹ "What is here given forms but a small part of this long and tedious description. Lucan's want of taste, and ignorance of what constitutes the essence of the true sublime, is no where so thoroughly displayed as where Cæsar's magnanimous "*quid times? Cæsarem velis*," is spun out into twelve dull lines of tedious declamation. I should have preferred giving this as an example of the false sublime, had it not been pre-occupied."—See Blair's *IVth Lecture*.

Σὺν δ' Εὐρύς τε Νότος τ' ἔπαισε, Ζέφυρός τε δυσαῆς,
Καὶ Βορέης αἰθρηγενέτης, μέγα κῦμα κυλίνδων.
Καὶ τότε Ὀδυσσεύς λυτο γούνατα καὶ φίλον ἦτορ.

Ὡς ἄρα μιν εἰπόντ' ἔλασεν μέγα κῦμα κατ' ἄκρης,
Δεινὸν ἐπεσσύμενον, περὶ δὲ σχεδὴν ἐλέλιξε.

Τῆλε δ' ἀπὸ σχεδὴς αὐτὸς πέσσε' πηδάλιον δὲ

Ἐκ χειρῶν προέηκε· μέσον δὲ οἱ ἰστὸν ἔαξε

Δεινὴ μισγομένων ἀνέμων ἐλθοῦσα θύελλα.

Τηλοῦ δὲ σπείρον καὶ ἐπὶ κριον ἔμπεσε πόντω·

Τὸν δ' ἄρ' ὑπὸ βρυχα θῆκε πολὺν χρόνον· οὐδὲ δυνάσθη

Ἀψα μάλ' ἀντ' ἐθέειν, μεγάλου ὑπὸ κύματος ὀρμῆς·

Εἵματα γάρ ῥ' ἐβάρυνε, τὰ οἱ πόρε διὰ Καλυψώ.

Ὅψε δὲ δὴ ῥ' ἀνέδου, στόματος δ' ἐξέπτυσσε ἄλμην

Πικρὴν, ἣ οἱ πολλὰ ἀπὸ κρατὸς κελάρυσεν.

Ἀλλ' οὐδ' ὥς σχεδὴς ἐπελήθετο, τειρόμενός περ,

Ἀλλὰ μεθορμηθεὶς ἐν κύμασιν, ἐλλάβετ' αὐτῆς·

Ἐν μέσση δὲ κάθιζε, τέλος θανάτου ἄλσειναι.

Τὴν δ' ἐφόρει μέγα κῦμα κατὰ ῥόον ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα.

Ὡς δ' ὅτ' ὀπωρινὸς Βορέης φορέησιν ἀκάνθας

Ἀμπεδίον, πυκινὰ δὲ πρὸς ἀλλήλησιν ἔχονται·

Ὡς τὴν ἀμπέλαγος ἄνεμοι φέρον ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα.

Ἄλλοτε μὲν τε Νότος Βορρῆ προβάλεσκε φέρεσθαι,

Ἄλλοτε δ' αὐτ' Εὐρύς Ζεφύρω εἴλασκε διώκειν.

* * * *

Ἔως ὁ ταῦθ' ὥρμαινε κατὰ φρένα καὶ κατὰ θυμόν,

Ὡρσε δ' ἐπὶ μέγα κῦμα Ποσειδάων ἐνοσίχθων,

Δεινόν τ', ἀργαλέον τε, κατηρερές ἦλασε δ' αὐτόν.

Ὡς δ' ἄνεμος ζαῆς ἠῶν θημῶνα τινάξῃ

Καρφαλέων, τὰ μὲν ἄρ' ἐπὶ δισκέδασ' ἄλλουδ' ἄλλῃ

Ὡς τῆς δούρατα μακρὰ δισκέδασ'——

Od. E. 291.

By the simile contained in the three last lines, the great Poet gives us a sublimer idea of the fury of the elements than Lucan has done in the whole of his long, labored, and pompous description.

Homer, by particularising the horrors of the scene, brings them in all their appalling reality before our eyes; whilst the unnatural exaggeration and vagueness of the Latin Poet scarcely excite in the mind any distinct image.

Perhaps indeed Poetry, like Painting, should always deal in *particulars*, and never in *generals*. Didactic and philosophical poems would invariably degenerate into mere versified declamation, were it not for the frequent introduction of episodes, individual examples, and minute descriptions. That Virgil and Akenside understood this,

the “Georgics” and “the Pleasures of Imagination” afford abundant proof. In Poetry, as far as possible, every thing should be either individual and picturesque, or endued with life and feeling; as, without this, it loses its distinctive character, and sinks into the cold and the prosaic.

In pursuit of the Beautiful, both the Poet and the Painter are liable to run into errors, scarcely less at variance with good taste than those which we have been considering. Of these the principal are,—crowding into their compositions too great variety; and introducing a load of ornament greater than the subject will warrant. But having occasion to speak of these afterwards, I merely mention them here.

He, who would attain to the Pathetic, has only to study his own feelings, to adhere to simplicity, and carefully shun even the appearance of affectation.

That the Pathetic, in either art, is founded on simplicity and nature, is well exemplified in the famous picture of Agamemnon by Timanthes;¹ and in the affecting exclamation of Macduff, in Shakspeare’s tragedy of Macbeth—“*He has no children!*”—The ingenuity of modern criticism has, I am aware, tortured out of these words a sense, very different from that in which I here take them; making them allude, not to Malcolm, but to the tyrant; and thus substituting for one of the most natural and touching sentences perhaps that ever was written, a sentiment of unmanly and diabolical revenge.²

¹ “The veil of Timanthes has not, however, escaped the censure of modern criticism. This judicious and singularly beautiful conception has been stigmatised as displaying poverty of imagination and want of invention.”

See Sir J. Reynolds’ *VIIIth Discourse*.

The same merciless criticism would, no doubt, fall foul of the following passage from “*Macbeth*,” which is conceived much in the spirit of the Grecian painter—“*What, man! ne’er pull your hat upon your brows so.*”—Yet these few and natural words bring the father in all his grief before us more strongly, perhaps, than the minutest description could have done. The author, who can produce such surprising effects by means apparently simple, excites in us something for which admiration is too weak a term.

² This passage has been taken three different ways.

1st. It has been applied to Malcolm: thus—“*He has no children*”—for if he had, he would know that a father cannot be so easily comforted.

2nd. It has been referred to Macbeth. “*He has no children*”—had he any, a father’s feelings for a father would have withheld him from the bloody deed.

3rd. It has been supposed to be expressive of regret that it would be impossible for him to take adequate vengeance on Macbeth, for “*He has no children*”—on whom to retaliate in sort.

History is at variance with the two last meanings, as it appears from it that Macbeth *had* children;—indeed, even in the play itself we find lady Macbeth using

III.—I shall now endeavour to show—that these arts pursue similar means of exciting attention, and keeping up interest, and that the very errors, into which they may be betrayed in the pursuit, have a striking analogy.

There is implanted in our nature a love of novelty or invention—of variety—and of contrast, in gratifying which all the fine arts are equally concerned.

In a poem, invention is an indispensable requisite ; for without it, the performance, however elegant or correct, will fail in its chief end, in rousing the imagination.* The mind loves to be exercised in the contemplation of something new ; and, when disappointed in this favorite object, is apt to sink into listlessness and apathy. As an exemplification of this, I would adduce the comparative indifference with which most Epic poems,—which are in general little more than imitations or even paraphrases of Homer,—are read by the classical scholar.¹ After the *Iliad*, even the *Æneid* itself appears relatively cold and uninteresting. We in vain look for something to gratify the craving appetite for novelty, and are constantly recognising old acquaintances,

these words—"I have given suck," &c. The last sense must, independent of this, be at once rejected, as implying a degree of brutality utterly inconsistent with Macduff's character. The context too is against this meaning. to his friend's exhortation that he would "dispute it as a man," he answers—"I shall do so ; but I must also *feel* it as a man." His mind, at first, is altogether occupied by grief for his loss—and it is not till the first transports are over that he begins to think of vengeance. Here, as elsewhere, our great poet has been true to nature. An author, however, is often the best commentator on himself. accordingly the following collateral passage from "*King John*" has been adduced in support of the *first* meaning.—"He talks to me that never had a son." But it must not be concealed that the advocates of the second have an authority equally in point :

"You have no *children*, butchers ; if you had,
The thought of them would have stirred up remorse."

Still the peculiar beauty of the *first* sense,—aided, as it is, by the weight of history,—must, I should think, give it the preponderance.

¹ [I by no means wish to say that all Epics after Homer's are necessarily devoid of interest. Such an assertion would be contrary both to truth and experience. Yet am I inclined to think, that he who has talent sufficient to render an heroic poem interesting, would be capable of writing something infinitely more so, were he to strike into a new path, and thus resign himself to his own genius and invention. Thus, though the *Æneid* is undoubtedly a fine poem, it is on the *Georgics*, as the corner-stone, that Virgil's fame chiefly rests. In truth it would seem as if the gigantic genius of Homer had not only originally invaded, but altogether occupied and engrossed, the heroic ground ; in consequence of which all succeeding settlers have assumed the appearance rather of subjects and pensioners, than of possessors in their own right. They resemble those parasitical plants which cling to the monarch of the woods, sink their fibres into his bark, and mount his loftiest branches, and are thus indebted to him not merely for their elevation, but for their very existence.

not only in the incidents, but in the very similes and turns of expression. Besides, the copy of a poem, like that of a painting, seldom, if ever, displays the spirit and truth of the original. Thus in Homer every thing seems the warm and immediate impression of nature, and possesses a degree of sharpness and spirit, which neither Virgil, nor any of his other copyists have yet attained.

Tasso is a poet of whom his countrymen are not a little proud;—yet let us but compare the sensations with which we read the “*Jerusalem Delivered*,” to those excited by the perusal of the poetry of Dante or Ariosto, and this will serve to confirm my position—that epic poems are read with comparatively less interest than those, in which the writer strikes out of the beaten track, and gives the reins to his own invention. The “*Henriade*,” which was, in its day, so extravagantly praised, appears to me to be as devoid of originality, as it is of nature and true poetic feeling. Indeed that it possesses but little claim to the first, the French critics themselves have been obliged, though reluctantly, to acknowledge.—A deficiency which they endeavour to palliate by reducing other poems to the same level.¹

To my theory “the *Paradise Lost*,” which possesses originality in so high a degree, forms a striking exception—if, indeed, that noble poem be, strictly speaking, an *epic*: a question which the elegant Addison, who first brought it into notice, has left undecided.²

We cannot accuse the poets of the present day of want of novelty. It is, indeed, in a great measure, by studying this quality, that they have succeeded in gaining so firm a hold of the imaginations of their readers, and in extending

¹ “Les rapports vagues et généraux dont je viens de parler, ont fait dire à quelques critiques, que la *Henriade* manquait du côté de l’invention : que ne fait-on le même reproche à *Virgile*, au *Tasse*, &c. ? Dans l’*Enéide* sont réunis les plans de l’*Iliade* et de l’*Odyssée* : dans la *Jérusalem délivrée* on trouve le plan de l’*Iliade* exactement suivi, et orné de quelques épisodes tirés de l’*Enéide*.”

Préface pour la Henriade par M. Marmontel.

Another writer speaks of this poem in the following terms : “ Il est inutile d’entrer dans un détail particulier de ses beautés les plus éclatantes. Il y en a, je l’avoue, plusieurs dont je crois reconnaître les originaux dans Homère, et surtout dans l’*Iliade*, copiés depuis avec différens succès par tous les poètes postérieurs.”

² “For this reason I shall waive the discussion of that point, which was started some years since, whether Milton’s *Paradise Lost* may be called an heroic poem. Those who will not give it that name, may call it, if they please, a *Divine Poem*.”

their empire over the public mind to a degree that threatens almost the total exclusion of older and chaster models.

That invention is of as much importance to Painting as to Poetry, is evident—when we consider that both these arts are equally concerned in exciting the energies of the mind, and in awakening the powers of the imagination.

Yet this same novelty must, like all other good qualities, be kept within certain limits. He who hunts after it at all costs, is more likely to disgust than entertain us, by his monstrous conceptions, which having in them nothing in common with our previous notions, will inevitably fail in calling forth our sympathy.¹

As a certain degree of novelty or invention is requisite to gain for a work a favorable reception, so is a judicious variety equally necessary to render it capable of pleasing long.

It is with this view that the poet introduces his episodes, and the painter his subordinate groups. But in the introduction of these adjuncts much art is necessary: they should ever be thrown in with a very sparing hand, just in such quantity as to ensure the mind against satiety; but never suffered to engross the whole attention, or even to divert it for too long a time from the principal channel. Nor will the skilful poet or painter rest satisfied with this negative merit. He will not be content with merely rendering these parts subordinate, but will endeavour also to make them actively co-operative towards the main design. The poet who indulges in digressions to an immoderate degree, instead of relieving, is sure to harass and fatigue his reader;—the interest, thus incessantly interrupted, is weakened or destroyed; our emotions checked in their very birth; and all the ardor of enthusiasm repressed and chilled.

If the introduction of too great variety be injurious in Poetry,—in Painting it is infinitely more prejudicial. For here, every thing is represented in a co-existent state; the

¹ The taste for Vampirism, &c. which has lately manifested itself in the British public, would seem to negative this position.—But surely this is but the morbid appetite of a day, and is no more like that legitimate love of novelty which is interwoven with our very nature—than the depraved appetite of a patient laboring under the disease which the Physicians call *Pica*, is to the same function in its natural state.—Persons afflicted with this disease are said to swallow greedily the most disgusting substances—such as tallow candles, cinders, chalk, &c.

See Rees' *Encyc.* Article *Pica*.

whole is laid open to the eye at once; and the mind is thus enabled to form a more speedy, as well as a more correct judgment of the conduct of the piece: hence if the fault alluded to exist, it is detected at the very first glance, and the mind is thrown into a state of restlessness and distraction totally incompatible with pleasurable emotions.

Whether such be not the sensation excited by a picture in which too great a variety either of lights or groups has been admitted, I appeal to the experience of every one.

When the eye thus ranges from figure to figure, and finds no principal object on which to rest, the piece is technically, and very expressively, said to want *reposé*,—a term which bears nearly the same relation to Painting, as “unity of design” does to Poetry. Where this injudicious variety has been indulged in, the spectator, how much soever he may admire the parts of the picture taken separately, will find it impossible to combine them into one uniform and consistent whole; the picturesque effect is totally destroyed, and the composition gives rise to feelings of dissatisfaction, if not disgust.

Thus the painter, in his anxiety to produce a splendid variety, often totally destroys that “fulness of effect”¹ which should ever be his prime object.

Excess of ornament is a fault closely connected with the preceding: in Poetry as well as in Painting it is too apt to seduce the attention from the general effect. Whatever ornaments have this tendency should be expunged without mercy; for, however great their intrinsic beauty, they will, if misplaced, inevitably detract from the interest of the performance² as a whole.

When we see an author thus lavish of his embellishments, it always makes us think that he has been more

¹ A picture is said to possess this quality (fulness of effect) when all the parts combine and harmonise, and, being brought as it were to a *focus* at or near the centre, strike upon the eye with united force.—It wants it, when, in consequence of ill arrangement, we are forced to look upon the several compartments as so many different pictures: and thus the effect of the whole is sacrificed to that of the constituent parts. The French school of Painting is said to furnish numerous instances of this fault. The following rule, from Du Fresnoy's *Art of Painting*, bears upon the subject before us:

“Sed si opere in magno plures thema grande requirat
Esse figurarum cumulos, spectabitur una
Machina tota rei, non singula quæque scorsim.”

² “Non refert quid facias, sed quo loco:—nam ornatus omnino non tam sua quam rei cui adhibetur conditione constat.” *Quintilian*.

anxious to display the exuberance of his own imagination, than to dress out his subject in the most becoming style. Such writers should recollect, that even the greatest beauty may be tricked out in such a profusion of ill-arranged finery, as will altogether destroy the symmetry of her form, and render her a much fitter object of ridicule and disgust, than of admiration.¹

This endless profusion of ornament is almost as cloying to the intellectual taste, as excessive sweetness is to the palate. That its prevalence has ever been proportionate to the decay of true taste, it were easy to prove, by a review of the histories of Painting, Architecture, and Sculpture, and by numberless instances from the later Greek and Latin writers. But we need not go to the ancients for examples of it. Our own age—nay our own country, furnishes us with a striking instance. The poet² to whom I allude, must be allowed, even by his warmest admirers, to intrude his glittering ornaments too frequently: he allows no rest, no respite. The beauties with which his writings are crowded, lose half their effect from want of relief: his pictures abound in strong lights, but are altogether destitute of that breadth of shadow necessary to give those lights effect;—they abound in bright and splendid colors, but want the dark ones requisite to give them their proper value. He forgets that the bright stars, so often his theme, owe half their brilliancy to the dark ground in which they are set.

All this may be laid to his charge, even supposing his ornaments to be of intrinsic value; but it will apply with double force should many of them prove, on nearer inspection, to be little better than prettinesses and conceits, calculated rather to play about the fancy than to reach the heart. What a contrast is there between his style and that of his chaste countryman Goldsmith! In him we detect no extraneous beauties; no foreign graces: his ornaments never seem to be dragged in, and as it were forced upon the subject, but to grow naturally out of it. Hence his poems may be read over and over again, and ever with increasing pleasure; hence the high poetical fame he has established, though all he has left us in this kind of writing does not exceed a few hundred lines.³

¹ "Pars minima est ipsa puella sui."—*Ovid*.

² Moore.

³ It is a pleasing consideration that this correct and elegant Poet was an Irish-

Simplicity of style is the opposite of that which we have been considering. Simplicity should, however, be looked upon as a negative rather than a positive quality; rather as intimating something to be avoided, than as proposing an object of pursuit.

The painter who prides himself on his simplicity of style, and simplicity alone, is too likely to become tame and insipid;¹ whilst the poet who makes it his exclusive aim is apt to run into a style which might, without any undue harshness, be denominated an *affectation of silliness*. Wordsworth, notwithstanding his fine poetical feeling, is from this very cause often quaint, and even ridiculous. He commences one of his poems thus—

“In distant countries I have been,
And yet I have not often seen
A healthy man, a man full grown,
Weep in the public roads alone.
But such a one on English ground,
And in the broad highway I met,
Along the broad highway he came,
His cheeks with tears were wet:
Sturdy he seem’d, though he was sad,
And in his arms a lamb he had.”

Again, in the conclusion of “the Idiot Boy,” we meet with the following notable stanza :

“And thus to Betty’s question he
Made answer like a traveller bold—

man; as he serves in some degree to atone for that floridness and bad taste for which his countrymen have in these days become almost proverbial. In that which our neighbours call emphatically the *Irish* style of oratory, this extravagance has been carried to its highest pitch of absurdity.

The corruption of eloquence and taste among the Romans is dated from the period when schools for declamation became general. May not we attribute effects somewhat similar to a society of which this University was, at no very distant period, so proud? When young men set up for orators, ere their judgment and taste are matured, and whilst their stock of ideas is still very limited, is it not almost inevitable that they should run into a florid, wordy style, from which they may never after be reclaimed, and which must effectually prevent them from arriving at real excellence? That this is not mere theory every one must know, who has paid any attention to a certain flimsy style of oratory which has sprung up within these few years, at the Irish Bar; and which may be traced in many instances, with considerable certainty, to the late *Historical Society* of Trinity College. Of the arguments which have been brought against the re-establishment of this institution, this is one, which has scarcely met with the attention it deserves.

¹ Sir J. Reynolds.

His very words I give to you :
 'The cock did crow to-whoo, to-whoo,
 And the sun did shine so cold.'
 Thus answer'd Johnny in his glory,
 And that was all his travel's story."

The style alluded to cannot, however, be fully exemplified by one or two insulated passages, though evident enough upon a continued perusal of the poetry of this amiable, and often deeply interesting writer.

All writers on the art of Painting enforce the necessity of *contrast*.² Some go so far as to say that not only the different figures of a group should contrast each other in attitude, size, and expression, but even that this same quality should be found in the relative 'position' of the limbs of each individual figure.

To the young painter such directions may be necessary, to prevent him from falling into an insipid, unvarying monotony : but that it was intended that the more advanced artist should adhere literally and inflexibly to this rule, is impossible : a picture composed in strict observance of such a law, would inevitably carry with it an air of stiffness and study totally at variance with nature. Besides, where this quality has been introduced in too great abundance, the spectator is sure to discover the art of the composer ; and being thus as it were admitted behind the scenes, ceases at once to feel the effects of a pleasing delusion.

By contrast, the Poet too is enabled to produce surprising effects ; but never more so than when he has the art to conceal his art.³

A beautiful instance of this judicious and natural contrast occurs in the *Iliad*, (X. 21.)

Ὡς εἰπὼν, πρὸτ' ἄστυ μέγα φρονέων ἐβεβήκει,
 Σευάμενος, ὥσθ' ἵππος ἀεθλοφόρος, σὺν ὄχρῳσφιν,

¹ See also "Alice Fell"—"We are Seven"—"The Kitten and the Falling Leaves"—"The Sparrow's Nest"—"Beggars"—"The Spade of a Friend"—"Louisa," &c. in the *Lyrical Ballads*.

² "Pluribus adversis aversam oppone figuram,
 Pectoribusque humeros, et dextra membra sinistris,
 Seu multis constabit opus, paucisve figuris."

Du Fresnoy, De Arte Graphica, l. 142.

See also Leonardo da Vinci.

³ "Artis est celare artem."

"Si lateat, prosit ; ferat ars deprensa vultorem !"

Ὅς ῥά τε βεῖα θέησι τιτανόμενος πεδίοιο.

* Ως Ἀχιλεὺς λαιψήρᾳ πόδας καὶ γούνατ' ἐνώμα.

Τὸν δ' ὁ γέρων Πρίαμος πρῶτος ἴδεν ὀφθαλμοῖσι,
Παμφαίονθ', ὥστ' ἄστέρ', ἐπεσσύμενον πεδίοιο—

* * * * *

* Ωμιώξεν δ' ὁ γέρων, κεφαλὴν δ' ὄγε κόψατο χερσίν,

* Τψόσ' ἀνασχόμενος, μέγα δ' οἰμώξας ἐγεγώνει—

* * * * *

* Ἡ ῥ' ὁ γέρων, πολιάς δ' ἄρ' ἀνὰ τρίχας ἔλκετο χερσὶ,

Τίλλων ἐκ κεφαλῆς—

* * * * *

Ὅ δέ οἱ σχεδὸν ἦλθεν Ἀχιλλεὺς,

* Ἴσος Ἐνυαλίῳ κορυθαίχι πτολεμιστῇ,

Σείων Ἠηλιάδα μελίην κατὰ δεξιὸν ὦμον,

Δεινὴν ἀμφὶ δὲ χαλκὸς ἐλάμπετο εἵκελος αὐγῇ

* Ἡ πυρὸς αἶθομένοιο, ἣ ἡλείου ἀνιόντος.¹

Here is contrast—strong marked contrast; yet all is so natural, that though every one must feel the beauty of the picture at first sight, it may be some time ere the effect is traced to its true source. Yet if any one can doubt that the striking effect of this passage originates in contrast, let him but for a moment suppose that the great painter had omitted either of these figures—and how much force and beauty does the other lose! Each, in its turn, throws out and relieves the other: the strength and energy of the hero being enhanced by the drooping figure of age; whilst, on the other hand, the feebleness of Priam, when viewed in conjunction with the youthful vigor of Achilles, degenerates into helplessness itself. That the picture was not drawn at random is incontestable, as numerous instances of the same kind are scattered throughout the *Iliad*. Of these I shall mention but one more—that passage in Book iii. where the young and beautiful Helen is contrasted with Priam and his hoary counsellors:

Οἱ δ' ἀμφὶ Πρίαμον, καὶ Πάνθοον, ἥδ' ἑ θυμοίτην, vs. 146

Λάμπον τε, Κλυτίον θ', Ἰκετάονά τ', ὄζον Ἀρης,

¹ This calls to mind a passage in the "Lay of the Last Minstrel," where youth and age are admirably contrasted—

"Bold Deloraine his errand said;
The porter bent his humble head;
With torch in hand and feet unshod,
And noiseless step, the path he trod;
The arched cloisters, far and wide,
Rang to the warrior's clanking stride." &c.

Οὐκαλέγων τε καὶ Ἀντήνωρ, πεπνυμένω ἄμφω,
 Εἶατο δημογέροντες ἐπὶ Σκαιῇσι πύλῃσι,
 Γῆραι δὴ πολέμοιο πεπαυμένοι· ἀλλ' ἀγορηταὶ
 Ἑσθλοὶ, τεττίγεσσιν ἑοικότες, οἷτε καὶ ὕλην
 Δενδρέω ἐφεζόμενοι ὅπα λειριόεσσαν ἰεῖσι·
 Τοῖοι ἄρα Τρώων ἡγήτορες ἦντ' ἐπὶ πύργῳ.
 Οἳ δ' ὥς οὖν εἶδον Ἑλένην ἐπὶ πύργον ἰοῦσαν,
 Ἦκα πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἔπεα πτερόεντ' ἀγόρευον.

The three succeeding lines, even independent of contrast, possess such a degree of force and beauty as were alone sufficient to prove Homer a genius of the highest order :

Οὐ νέμεσις, Τρῳᾶς καὶ εὐκνήμιδας Ἀχαιοὺς
 Τοιῇδ' ἀμφὶ γυναικὶ πολὺν χρόνον ἄλγεα πάσχειν·
 Αἰνῶς ἀθανάτησι θεῇς εἰς ὧπα ἔοικεν.

Here we find a set of aged men, over whose passions the icy hand of time had passed, and whose minds were; at that very moment, irritated by all the losses and privations attendant on a protracted siege,—a siege, too, of which Helen had been the sole cause,—profess themselves fully repaid for all their sufferings by the privilege of gazing on so much beauty. No particular delineation, however highly wrought, could have given us so exalted an idea of her fatal charms. Tasso's description of the beauty of Armida¹ is the most finished thing of the kind I can at present recollect—yet how poor does it appear in comparison !

Argo non mai, non vide Cipro o Delo,
 D' abito o di beltà forme sì care.
 D' auro hà la chioma ; ed or dal bianco velo
 Traluce involta, or discoperta appare.
 Così qualor si rasserenà il cielo,
 Or da candida nube il sol traspare ;
 Or dallà nube uscendo, i raggi intorno
 Più chiari spiega, e ne raddoppia il giorno.

Fà nuove crespe l' aura al crin disciolto,
 Che natura per se rincrespa in onde :

¹ Canto iv. Stanza 29. Fairfax, in his translation of this passage, has almost surpassed the original.

Stassi l' avaro sguardo in se raccolto,
 E i tesori d' amore, e i suoi nasconde.
 Dolce color di rose in quel bel volto
 Fra l' avorio si sparge, e si confonde:
 Ma nella bocca, ond' esce aura amorosa,
 Sola rosseggia e semplice la rosa.

Mostra il bel petto le sue nevi ignude,
 Onde il fuoco d' amor si nutre e desta:
 Parte appar delle mamme acerbe e crude,
 Parte altrui ne ricopre invida vesta;
 Invida ma s' agli occhi il varco chiude,
 L' amoroso pensier già non arresta;
 Chè non ben paga di bellezza esterna,
 Negli occulti secreti anco s' interna.

Come per acqua o per cristallo, intero
 Trapassa il raggio, e nol divide o parte;
 Per entro il chiuso manto osa il pensiero
 Sì penetrar nella vietata parte:
 Ivi si spazia, ivi contempla il vero
 Di tante meraviglie a parte a parte;
 Poscia al desio le narra e le descrive,
 E ne fà le sue fiamme in lui più vive.

But it is in the judicious and masterly style in which the parts in Homer's great drama are cast—the fine contrast between his characters—and the admirable manner in which that contrast is supported, through a long and varied action, that his amazing powers are best displayed. To support this by examples would, however, far exceed the limits of this essay: I shall therefore conclude what I have to say on contrast, by two quotations from Shakspeare. The first occurs in *Macbeth*, and forms a very pleasing relief to the dark and sanguinary scenes in which the piece abounds:

King.—This castle hath a pleasant seat; the air
 Nimble and sweetly recommends itself
 Unto our gentle senses.

Banquo.—This guest of summer,
 The temple-haunting martlet, does approve
 By his lov'd mansionry, that the heaven's breath
 Smells woefully here: no jutty frieze,

Buttress, nor coigne of vantage, but this bird
Hath made his pendant nest and procreant cradle ;
Where they most breed and haunt, I have observed,
The air is delicate.————

To our feelings, harassed by the contemplation of beings at once supernatural and malignant, as well as by the display of human nature in its worst point of view, how refreshing is this easy and natural conversation!—Thus insulated, indeed, the passage loses more than half its beauty: to feel it in its full force we must connect it with what precedes and follows.

Again, in Julius Cæsar—Brutus, alarmed by the apparition, calls to his page: the boy, who had been endeavouring but a short time before to solace his master's cares with music, and whose ideas are still running on the same subject, cries out from his sleep,

The strings, my lord, are false!——

What a beautiful contrast have we here!—Brutus, exhausted by watching and fatigue, and irritated by the intrusion of his unearthly visitant; whilst the boy, little conscious of his master's uneasiness, sleeps undisturbed, and only dreams of music. There is something beautifully natural in this conception, which affords more genuine pleasure than all the heartless declamation which is generally crowded into the five acts of a legitimate French tragedy. Such passages as this evince talents of the highest cast, and are only to be found in poets of the first class. Voltaire, the man who affects to laugh at and despise Shakspeare, would not have struck upon such an idea till the end of time.*

Thus have we seen that Poetry and Painting rest on one and the same foundation;—that they aim at producing similar effects on the mind;—that to produce these effects they frequently embrace similar means;—and lastly, that in their very errors, much resemblance is often discoverable.

I shall conclude this essay by a few quotations from those poets who have most closely approximated their art to painting; or who have, in other words, excelled in

* In speaking of our great Dramatist he somewhere uses the following words: "Il n'y a pas un babouin en Afrique qui n'ait plus de goût, que Shakspeare." And truly, if the French judge of him through the medium of Voltaire's translation, they are likely to come to the same conclusion.

description. This, probably, will demonstrate the close alliance of these arts more satisfactorily than the minutest abstract enquiries could do.

Homer naturally presents himself first to our view. The instances of his graphic powers are so numerous and excellent, that it is difficult to know which claims the preference. Perhaps, however, on the whole, the description of the shield of Achilles is his greatest effort in this way; and of the pictures which it contains, none displays a better choice and arrangement of incidents than the following :

Ἐν δ' ἀγέλην ποίησε βοῶν ὀρθοκραιράων·
 Αἱ δὲ βόες χρυσοῖο τετεύχματο, κασσιτέρου τε,
 Μυκηθμῶ δ' ἀπὸ κόπρου ἐπεσσεύοντο νομόνδε
 Παρ ποταμὸν κελάδοντα, περὶ ῥοδανόν, θονακῆα.
 Χρῦσοιο δὲ νομῆες ἅμ' ἐστιχόωντο βόεσσι
 Τέσσαρες, ἐννέα δέ σφι κύνες πόδας ἄργυοῖ ἔποντο.
 Σμερδαλέω δὲ λένοντε δὺ' ἐν πρώτῃσι βίεσσι
 Ταῦρον ἐρύγμηλον ἐχέτην· ὁ δὲ, μακρὰ μεμυκώς
 Ἐλκετο· τὸν δὲ κύνες μετεκίαθον, ἥδ' αἰζηοί.
 Τῷ μὲν ἀναρρήξαντε βοὸς μέγαλοιο βοείην,
 Ἐγκατα καὶ μέλαν αἶμα λαφύσσετον· οἱ δὲ νομῆες
 Αὐτῷ ἐνδίσσαν, ταχέας κύνας ὀτρύνοντες.
 Οἱ δ' ἦτοι δακέειν μὲν ἀπετρωπῶντο λεόντων,
 Ἰσταμένοι δὲ μάλ' ἐγγὺς ὑλάκτεον, ἔκ τ' ἄλεοντο. *Il. Σ. 573.*

There is here so much life and spirit, and all the circumstances are introduced with so much propriety and effect, that we absolutely feel ourselves spectators of the scene. There is not in the whole description a single word which we could wish to be changed. Perhaps, indeed, the term *μυκηθμῶ*, applied to the lowing of the cattle, may offend some surly critic, and appear to him an improper circumstance for painting:—in the eyes of the painter, however, who is better acquainted with the resources of the art, it will have no impropriety, but rather be considered as an additional beauty.

Æschylus possessed this power in an eminent degree, as the following group, conceived in a spirit of terrible sublimity, fully evinces :¹

Αὐτὸς κατόπτης δ' εἴμ' ἐγὼ τῶν πραγμάτων

¹ Septem contra Thebas, l. 42.

Ἄνδρες γὰρ ἑπτὰ, θούριοι λοχαγέται,
 Ταυροσφαγοῦντες εἰς μελάνδετον σάκος,
 Καὶ θιγγάνοντες χερσὶ ταυρείου φόνου,
 Ἄρην, Ἐνυώ, καὶ φιλαίματον Φόβον
 Ὀρκωμότησαν, ἣ πόλει κατατκαφὰς
 Θέντες, λαπάξιν ἄστει Καδμείων βίχ,
 Ἡ γῆν θανόντες τήνδε φυράσειν φόνῳ.
 Μνημεῖα θ' αὐτῶν τοῖς τεκοῦσιν εἰς δόμους
 Πρὸς ἄρμ' Ἀδράστου χερσὶν ἔστερον, δάκρυ
 Λαίβοντες· οἶκτος δ' οὔτις ἦν διὰ στόμα·
 Σιδηροφθῶν γὰρ θυμὸς, ἀνδρεία φλέγων,
 Ἐπνει, λείοντων ὥς Ἄρην δεδορκότων.

The following highly picturesque landscape from Virgil forms a pleasing contrast to the horrors of the preceding scene :

Est in secessu longo locus : insula portum
 Efficit objectu laterum, quibus omnis ab alto
 Frangitur, inque sinus scindit sese unda reductos.
 Hinc atque hinc vastæ rupes, geminique minantur
 In cœlum scopuli, quorum sub vertice late
 Æquora tuta silent : tum sylvis scena coruscis
 Desuper, horrentique atrum nemus imminet umbra.
 Fronte sub adversa scopulis pendentibus antrum ;
 Intus aquæ dulces, vivoque sedilia saxo ;
 Nympharum domus. Hic fessas non vincula naves
 Ulla tenent ; unco non adligat ancora morsu.

Æn. i. 163.

But Shakspeare, who has tried almost every style of writing, and succeeded in all that he has tried, stands pre-eminent in power of description.

His imagination, scarcely inferior to that attributed to the magician's wand, can conjure up ideal scenes, and give them all the force of reality. I shall indulge in but a single example :

Here's the place : stand still : how fearful
 And dizzy 'tis to cast one's eyes so low !
 The crows and choughs, that wing the midway air,
 Show scarce so gross as beetles : halfway down
 Hangs one that gathers samphire ; dreadful trade !
 Methinks he seems no bigger than his head :
 The fishermen, that walk upon the beach,

Appear like mice; and yor tall bark
 Diminished to her cbeck; her cock a buoy,
 Almost too small for sight: the murmuring surge,
 That on the unnumbered idle pebbles chafes,
 Cannot be heard so high—I'll look no more,
 Lest my brain turn.—

It has been well remarked, that he, who can read this passage without becoming dizzy, must have a good, or a very bad head.¹

But of all the writers of this or any preceding age, the author of "*The Lay of the Last Minstrel*" is perhaps he who has most strikingly exemplified the close alliance of the kindred arts. To his admirers a thousand instances of the truth of this will immediately occur. Suffice it to adduce one:

If thou wouldst view fair Melrose aright,
 Go visit it by pale moon-light;
 For the gay beams of lightsome day
 Gild but to flout the ruins gray.
 When the broken arches are black in night,
 And each shafted oriel glimmers white;
 When the cold light's uncertain shower
 Streams on the ruined central tower,
 Where buttress and buttress alternately
 Seem framed of ebon and ivory;
 When silver edges the imagery,
 And the scrolls that teach to live and die;
 When distant Tweed is heard to rave,
 And the owlet to hoot on the dead man's grave—
 Then go—but go alone the while—
 Then view St. David's ruined pile;
 And home returning, soothly swear,
 Was never scene so sad and fair.²

Equally vivid is the impression produced by the description of the interior of the Abbey. The concluding lines,

¹ Addison in the Tatler.

² Such passages as this call to mind the words of a well-known popular writer, Blair. "The good poet makes us imagine that we see the object of his description before our eyes; he catches the distinguishing features; he gives it the colors of life and reality; he places it in such a light, that the painter could copy after him."—chap. xi.

and especially the very last, are picturesque in the highest degree :

The silver light, so pale and faint,
Showed many an image, and many a saint,
Whose image in the glass was dyed :
Full in the midst, his cross of red
Triumphant Michael brandished,
And trampled the apostate's pride.
The moon-beam kissed the holy pane,
And threw on the pavement a bloody stain.

Is not this, I would ask, *Painting*?—does it not produce on the mind an effect as precise and as vivid? Who has perused this description, that does not reflect on it rather as a real scene which he has actually surveyed, than as a mere passage which he has read?¹

In short, if ever there existed the man, whose “imagination could body forth the forms of things unknown, turn them to shape, and give to airy nothing a local habitation and a name”—that man is SCOTT.

July, 1821.

WILLIAM BRUCE JOY, A.B.
TRIN. COLL. DUB.

*On the Present System of Academic Education in the
University of Cambridge.*

Ne forte putes, me, quæ facere ipse recusem,
Cum recte tractent alii, laudare maligne.

HOR.

THE return of the annual season for taking A. B. degrees, has led me into a train of thinking, productive of so strong and

¹ Were collateral proof altogether wanting, this magic power would alone be sufficient to identify the author of a series of *splendid Novels*, which have lately made their appearance, and excited a degree of attention and curiosity almost unprecedented in the annals of literature. In them are displayed the same graphic powers—the same reality of effect in his landscapes—the same skill in forming his groups, and giving expression and individuality to the figures of which they are composed.

The scenes which he describes take as firm a hold of the memory as those of our childhood; whilst the characters which he introduces to our notice are ever reflected on,—not merely as actual existences,—but as old friends.

forcible conviction to my own mind, that I wish to lay the result before others also. In so doing, I am aware that I am adopting a measure pregnant perhaps with important consequences, likely to excite clamor and ill-will from some, and to be received with jealousy by others; to be railed at by the violent, and deprecated by the timid; which must encounter the prejudices of some, the distrust of others, and the criticisms of all. For all this I am perfectly prepared; because I know that this collision of opinions is most advantageous to the cause of truth, and because, having myself no end to gain, no party to serve, and no ambition to gratify, I consider free, public, and unrestricted discussion, as advantageous and even necessary to the objects of my inquiry. That inquiry I hope myself to pursue with temper and moderation; and if it should excite anger or asperity on the part of my antagonists, I trust I shall neither resent nor retaliate. Indeed it is not very likely that I shall reply. I am too much engaged with other concerns to take an active part in controversy, and the end I propose will be sufficiently answered in having thus opened the way to discussion. Others may carry it on, and in a University containing so great a number of able men, it is not *very* probable that the question will soon be suffered to fall asleep.

The inquiry which I wish to make, and to see pursued, is this, Why is the examination for degrees, why are the honors, and, generally speaking, the rewards and patronage of the University, confined so *exclusively* to mathematical pursuits?

Mathematics are, no doubt, a high and important *branch* of study. They are a science closely concerned in the investigation of abstract truth, requiring intensity of attention, accuracy of research, acuteness of application, and severity of judgment; they are intimately connected with the most useful arts, and with the sublimest speculations; with those inventions which give man power over the world in which he is placed, and with those discoveries which elevate him to the knowledge and contemplation of the worlds beyond and around him. With this admission, cordially and willingly made, no man can fairly accuse me of depreciating or undervaluing the importance of mathematical studies, although I may still make it a question why they should be so *exclusively* pursued. Let us come at once from speculations to facts.

On an average for the last three years, 146 men enter the senate-house annually, at the usual degree time.

Of these, 52 obtain honors: of whom 19 are wranglers, or

proficients in mathematics; 19 are senior optimés, or second-rate¹ mathematicians; 14 are junior optimés, or smatterers.²

What are the remaining 94? What have they to show for an education of three years and a quarter, at an expense which cannot be short of 700*l.*? What have they got in religion, ethics, metaphysics, history, classics, jurisprudence? Who can tell? For, except the short examination of one day in Locke, Paley, and Butler, in the senate-house, the *University* must be supposed to know *nothing* of their progress in these things. Their *University examination* for their degree is in *mathematics*, and if they have got four books of Euclid (or even less), can answer a sum in arithmetic, and solve a simple equation, they are deemed qualified for their degree, that is, the *University* pronounces this a *sufficient progress*, after three years and a quarter of study.

So much for the *Πολλοί*, the *vulgus ignobile* of the mathematical students, among whom I include what are commonly called gulph men—that is, men who *can* answer and *will not*, and who are therefore entitled to no distinction in the view now taken of an *University examination*.

Let us look back to those distinguished with academic honors.

Of the junior optimés, do *any* bring their reading in mathematics to after use?

Of the senior optimés, do any *two* in each year keep up or pursue their mathematical learning, so as to make farther proficiency in it after they have taken their degree?

Of the wranglers, do many of the lower wranglers, and all or nearly all the higher, pursue their mathematical studies farther than to qualify for fellowship examination, which at some Colleges, as at Trinity, for instance, are partly mathematical? In fact, do more than two-thirds of the wranglers pursue their mathematical studies after they have taken their degrees?

If they do not, then all the fruits of three years and a quarter's study, and all the expenses of 146 men, amounting to above 100,000*l.*, are concentrated, as far as any literary benefit results from them, in about a dozen or fifteen individuals.³

Of these individuals I cannot be supposed to speak or think

¹ I use plain terms, without intending to convey any reproach. In an inquiry of this sort, we must look to *facts*, not *compliments*.

² It is evident, that if I had taken into account either the year 1818, or the present enormously large year, the result of these calculations would have been far more striking in my favor: but I seek truth, and do not wish merely to make out a case.

³ It is evident that this calculation is greatly under-rated. 700*l.* is, I fear, considerably under the average amount of the total expenses

330 *On the present System of Education*

disrespectfully, when I ask, of what *use* to them are their mathematics, without the walls of the University, in common life?

How many Cambridge mathematicians distinguish themselves by *bringing their mathematics to bear* upon the useful arts?

Is it true that they, generally speaking, turn their mathematics to any account, except that of speculative amusement, or academic contention?

They may be, and no doubt they often are, very ingenious and acute men; but does that ingenuity and acuteness, for the most part, *tell*, to any great moral, or political, or social purpose?

Are not, in fact, the greater number of calculations and combinations by which mathematics are brought to bear upon the arts, made by men who have not received an academic education?

Are not *practical* mathematics the great source of useful inventions; and are not the Cambridge mathematics almost *exclusively speculative*?

Take a junior or senior optimé, or even a wrangler, into an irregular field with a common land-surveyor, and ask them severally to measure it; which will do it soonest, and best?

Let one of each of these academic graduates and a practical sailor be sailing towards an unknown coast; which will soonest make a correct observation?

Build a bridge across the Thames; who will do it best, Mr. Rennie (supposing him still alive), or a committee of senior wranglers?

If it should happen that in these cases the *practical* mathematicians would have the advantage, may it not be said, that *our* mathematics are more for *show* than *use*?

It may be urged, that we point out the *principle*, and leave to others the *practice*. This may be very true; but I believe the laugh would be a good deal against the speculative academic, who was beaten by the practical clown; and though I admit that ridicule is no test of truth, there would, in this case, be a good deal of reason on its side. I can see no grounds for neglecting

of a University education, and there are a considerable number of men who take their degrees at by-terms, very few indeed, of whom ever think of reading more than is absolutely necessary for their degree, which is, I will not say how *much*. A nearer calculation would be, to allow at least 800*l.* for the expenses of education, and to add 24 men to the average above mentioned, making the whole number 170, the sum total of whose expenses therefore is 136,000*l.*

practice, because we understand *theory*; and if we profess to make mathematics our prime pursuit, surely we ought to comprehend not only their *principles*, but also their *application*.

Enough of this.—Let me be permitted to make a few observations on the examination itself, especially that which respects the higher class of honors.

Ever since the days of Samson, riddles have been thought a great test of the acuteness of the human mind. After the time that he puzzled the Philistines, the Sphinx puzzled the Thebans, and the Queen of Sheba tried to puzzle Solomon. And, in conformity with this custom, in which sacred and profane histories alike concur, after a lapse of between three and four thousand years, the examiners in the senate-house still propose *riddles* to their examinants.

What is the greater part of that examination but a set of mathematical conundrums, in which each examiner tries to display his ingenuity by quibbling subtleties, by little *niceties* and *knackeries*, and *tricks* of the art, which are for the most part exceedingly clever and exceedingly unprofitable, and which bear a close, I may say a *very close*, affinity to those hair-breadth theological and metaphysical distinctions, which baffled, and perplexed, and expended in the most abstruse and idle speculations, the intellectual faculties of schoolmen and Aristotelians in the middle ages?

Alas! all *their* labors are now considered but idle paradoxes and waste of pains.

What will future ages say of *our own*? STULTUS LABOR EST INEPTIARUM. We have even deserted the track of geometry, and forsaken the path our mighty master trod. In that very University whose pride it was to have produced that man who surpassed the race of mankind in intellect, his own labors are neglected, and his own gigantic discoveries no longer occupy that proud and pre-eminent station which is due to their intrinsic merit, and to his immortal name, to national honor, and to academic veneration. A new *fashion* in mathematics is introduced, and one, which in some respects seems less calculated to attain the end for which mathematical studies are supposed to be pursued, by detracting from the *closeness* of geometrical investigation.

Venimus ad summum fortunæ. We can go no farther in the old school. We must have new refinements, new quirks, new capriccios of ingenuity, to satisfy the restless impatience of ambitious minds. We must gain distinction by a new track; the *vetus orbita* will serve no longer; it is too much worn; a man is buried in the ruts, and cannot rise out from them to any eminence of distinction. We must, from time to time, strike out a

new path, in which the love of novelty and the love of fame, those two bright coursers of æthèrial breed, may bear us above the heads of our contemporaries.

But there is one melancholy fact; a certain indication of incipient decay in any people, is when their refinements begin to be *excessive*. As soon as the true and legitimate standard of taste and judgment, either in morals or science, is exceeded, it is even more difficult to *retrograde* towards perfection than it was before to ascend to it. It is hard, indeed, to save ourselves when, having climbed up the mountain on one side, we have begun to topple down the precipice on the other.

There is another point well deserving our consideration, on which I have not yet touched. Suppose mathematics not to be the *exclusive* branch of academic examination in this University, would there be any deficiency of great and eminent mathematicians? I cannot conceive, that were a *fair and due* degree of honor given to mathematical pursuits, without an *exclusive* preference, there would be any want of persons sufficiently inclined to cultivate and excel in them. I do not know, and I do not believe, that in the days of Barrow, Newton, and Cotes, the same *exclusive* attention was paid to mathematics as at the present time, nor do I conceive that any modern names can be disgraced by a comparison with these. The same stimulus which was *then* sufficient to produce a Newton, would always operate to produce one, although there were no exclusive preference given to mathematics, and no exclusive rewards.

A university is a society of students in *all and every* of the liberal arts and sciences. How then can that society deserve the name, which confines its studies almost entirely to *one*! This exclusive preference militates against the very spirit of our institution, and certainly damps the ardor and cramps the genius of many a man who might excel in classical or metaphysical pursuits, by compelling him to adopt a course of study for which he has neither talent nor inclination, but in which he is *compelled* to delve and toil, if he wishes to attain any academical reward.

Such a one hath the curse of Adam entailed upon him with bitter severity: "*In the sweat of his brow doth he eat bread.*" In truth, it is a known and acknowledged fact, that the severity of the senate-house examination, and the dryness of mathematical pursuits, induces many men, even after one or two years' trial, or even more, and after having with infinite toil and labor made some progress on their cheerless way, to abandon all competition for mathematical honors, and content themselves with barely getting their degree.

Of what use are all their studies to them?

It may be said, that they have themselves only to blame, and should have persevered : and this is true in the abstract, but, like many theories, fails in the application.

With human beings, allowance must be made for human failings and imperfections ; and if the mind sinks under the load that is laid upon it, they who lay that load are not, themselves, exempt from blame.

What then do I advise ? The relinquishment of mathematical pursuits ? By no means. I would give equal *honor*, nay, concede all that can fairly be conceded to long-established habits and prejudices ; I would give *precedence* to mathematical studies, but not *exclusive privileges and rewards*.

“ *Nec nihil neque omnia.* ”

I would give a large and liberal share of honors and rewards to classical studies, not only in the distribution of classical prizes at present existing by the benefactions of various founders, but in the senate-house examination, and in the classification of academic degrees.

I have heard from the examining chaplains of some bishops, a remark, which I believe is pretty general, and which, as I am persuaded most of the members of this University will understand it sufficiently by this allusion, it is unnecessary to place more prominently on record. The only objections which have been made to the establishment of a public examination at the end of the second year, in which a certain knowledge of the Greek Testament and the principles of religion should be a *sine qua non* towards passing for the senate-house degree, have rested on the interruption such an examination would give to the higher reading men, in the mathematical pursuits. I am sorry to think such an objection should be urged by men, whom I believe to be very sincere Christians, and very good, and, in all respects, where prejudice does not operate, very wise men. But, in this instance, I confess I think them influenced by partiality for usage now some time established, and for their favorite science and pursuits.

What would be thought of a man who should assert, that it was much better to be a good classic than a good Christian ? that it would be a pity to read the Greek Testament, lest it should interrupt his study of Aristophanes ? And what right have mathematical studies to an exemption, which would not be granted to a student in classics, or any other branch of learning ?

But granting that such an examination would cause a short interruption to mathematical pursuits, which is granting more

than is necessarily due, what *injury* would it be to *any*, since the interruption would be *alike to all*? It would give no undue advantage to one above another, since *all* must submit to it; and supposing it occasioned *all* to know a problem or two less, would any *real* evil result from this defect, or any inconvenience, which would not be counterbalanced by great and substantial good? Admit, which is a great deal more than is ever likely to happen or be proved, that it prevents A. from being senior wrangler, then B. will be senior wrangler instead; and the course of mathematical examination will be just the same, whatever may be the result of it to this or that individual.

So far, therefore, the effect of this minor examination, on that at present in usage for the degree, must be absolutely harmless; but beyond this, the result to every one of the examiners must be productive of great and substantial good, by bringing them acquainted with the grounds and principles of their faith, by leading them to that knowledge, in comparison with which all other knowledge is idle and unprofitable, and guiding them to the search after those truths, in comparison with which all mathematical truth is vanity itself.

I may add, that the beneficial *consequences* of such an examination are incalculable. When the impression is made in early life, and the minds of young men are directed towards the consideration of those great and important truths, which are inseparably connected with the eternal interests of themselves and of all mankind, the impression will never be wholly worn out, there will always be a tendency of thoughts and inclinations to this great object, and the *germ* of Christianity may be preserved, even amidst the temporary allurements of the gayest scenes of pleasure and dissipation. If it springs not immediately, it may in later life; it may at least prove a preservative against the blasphemies of infidelity; and it may guard men from being led, by late repentance, to the extravagances of fanaticism and wild enthusiasm.

On all these grounds, and on many others which might be urged, I see strong and even irresistible arguments in favor of a general preparatory examination. *That* examination should confer no honors, and concede no exemption. It should be plain, perspicuous, and intelligible. No puzzling questions should be asked, because, as no distinctions of honor are granted, no trial of *genius* is necessary. The *majority* of young men educated at this University are designed for holy orders; but even were it not so, every layman who calls himself a Christian, certainly every layman who has received a liberal education in a

Christian University, ought to know something of the proofs, history, and doctrines of the Christian religion. The very least that can be required, is a knowledge of the Gospels in their original tongue, the proofs of natural and revealed religion, and a general acquaintance with Scripture history to the time of the Apostles. I do not pretend to dictate to the good sense of the University; but as a member of it, I may be allowed, without presumption, to state, that I think the Greek Gospels, Grotius de Veritate, and the first volume of Bishop Tomline's Theology, are sufficient for the proposed examination. No burden is laid on any man by requiring an acquaintance with these. It is his duty to know these, and if he does not know them by the time he has been two years at the University, there is infinite blame imputable either to his instructors or to himself.

I know very well what may be alleged about the procrastination of these studies till after the degree of A. B. has been taken; but I do not stop to combat arguments of this sort; they bear their own refutation in themselves, like many of those which may be urged by my adversaries on minor topics. If any of these gentlemen will tell me, that it is of no consequence if a young man of twenty dies ignorant of the truths of Christianity, because there is a chance of his living to know them at the age of twenty-two, I will then say that his tutors may have some excuse for withdrawing his attention to them till he has no farther occasion for their services.

So much for this subject. I am content merely to throw out hints on it, because I have little time for more, and trust these will be sufficient for future exertions. Will it be allowed me to state my own view of the improved system, in the most general terms, leaving the detail and modification of them to the sense of the University?

I would oblige every man, at the expiration of his two first years, to undergo the above-mentioned preparatory examination; and he should then be called upon to declare whether he intended to graduate in mathematics, or classics, which should not preclude him from offering himself for examination in the senate-house in both. In the senate-house examination, the week for mathematics should proceed as usual. That for classics should follow, in which there should be a first, second, and third class, as in mathematics. Let the senior wrangler preserve his pre-eminence, and next to him the first of the first class classics; then the other wranglers, who, in most cases, should not exceed 15, and then the other first class classics, who should not exceed the like number. Next to these, mathematical senior optimés,

not exceeding 14; and then second class classics, to the same number. Then the mathematical junior optimés, and the third class classics, whose number should not exceed ten respectively. This would give, supposing each class full, 40 mathematical, and as many classical honors; but it is to be presumed that several men would be ranked in both classes. If the fellowships of the University are distributed with due regard to these honors, no doubt a greater emulation will be excited to excel in both departments.

Σχῆδον εἴρηκα. But I must add a few words on the classical examination. It would of course comprise not merely the construing Greek and Latin, but a variety of questions connected with the passages selected, and depending on history, antiquities, chronology, geography, metrical and philological criticism, and ancient philosophy. And this leads me to a remark, which will perhaps be unpalatable to some of our distinguished scholars, but which truth compels me not to omit. I mean, that our range of Greek reading is at present too much confined. We labor about the dramatic writers too much, to the exclusion of the rest. We weary ourselves with adjusting iambs, and trochaics, and anapæstics, and twisting monostrophics into choruses and dochmiacs, and almost seem to neglect the sense for the sake of the sound. I do not mean to disparage these labors, which are sometimes learned, and often ingenious; but I wish merely to hint, that if these things are *good*, there are also *better things* than these. We must not forsake the critics, philosophers, orators, and historians of Greece, for a mere branch of her poets; and I fearlessly say, without risk of contradiction from the most competent and able judges, that Plato, Aristotle, Xenophon, Thucydides, Polybius, and Demosthenes, afford more improvement to the taste, and purification to the morals, more exercise for thought and reflection, more dignity to the conceptions, and enlargement to the understanding of the student, than all the Greek tragedies that were ever penned. Not that I affect to slight or despise those noble monuments of the Grecian Muse, which are yet left to us in the works of her dramatic writers; but I underprize them in comparison of the mighty names I have enumerated, and think that *too much* is sacrificed to them, if *these* are neglected in consequence. This remark, and all those which have preceded it, will, I hope, be taken in good part by all considerate and thinking men. I wish to offend none; but I am sufficiently aware, that the subject I have handled is of a nature liable to excite the jealousy of some, and awake the fears of others. The attack or defence, however,

of these remarks I shall leave to other hands. I appear now, probably, for the first and last time, in the contest. I have said nothing but from an ardent wish for the honor and credit of the University, and the promotion of public good, by directing our studies to great and useful purposes, and enabling the majority of students who come to this place for instruction, to carry something away in one branch of literature, if they cannot in another.

Cambridge, Jan. 1822.

EUBULUS.

E. H. BARKER'S REPLY TO *BOINTOS*.

1. IN an article, inserted in your last No., entitled *Nugæ*, and subscribed *BOINTOS*, (though evidently the composition of a learned *Theban*,) the Author (in p. 9.) quotes the following verses,

“ pudet hæc opprobria nobis

“ Et dici potuisse, et non potuisse refelli,”

and then adds:—“ Where is this often-quoted sentence to be found? We conclude, from its having passed muster safely for so many ages, that it is of genuine classical growth; otherwise we should be almost disposed to protest against *nobis* as a barbarism.”

I am happy to be able at once to answer his question, and to refute his criticism. The verses will be found in Ovid, *Met.* i, 759.;¹ and, if he will in his mind's eye place a comma after *pudet*, he will see no “barbarism” in *nobis*, which depends on *dici*, not on *pudet*.

I would respectfully recommend to his notice the following work, which is, however, very scarce:—“ *Acute Dicta omnium veterum Poëtarum Latinorum, Opus editum ad Usam Serenissimi Ducis Guisii; cui præfixum Philippi Brietii Abbavillæi, Soc. Jesu Sacerdotis, de omnibus jisdem Poëtis Syntagma. Parisiis, 1664. 12°. pp. 596.*” It will furnish him with the means of detecting the authors of many verses, which learned men are in the habit of quoting, though very few of them perhaps know the sources, from which the verses are taken. But the lines of Ovid do not appear in the collection.

2. *BOINTOS* begins his article with the following words:—“ Orthography of *silva*—*Non nostrum tantas componere*

¹ Dr. Carey has favored us with the same information. Ed.

lites, to use the formula of a sceptical friend of ours, 'we shall not express any opinion on this controverted topic, not having considered the subject.' He is referring to two Papers on this subject, of which the former will be found in Class. Journ. xlv. 30—31, and the latter, written by myself, in No. xlv. 309—12. Both advocate the propriety of writing *silva*, not *sylva*; and I have produced such testimonies for that orthography, as, I should have expected, would enable your inquisitive and erudite correspondent to form a decided "opinion on this controverted topic." I may be entitled to more authority with him, when I remark that I had once maintained the accuracy of the other form, but rejected it entirely in consequence of the weight of proof against it.

3. He adds:—"Of this species of depravation, (i. e. accommodating the orthography of the ancient Latin to the genius of the writer's or editor's own language,) we have many instances in our own language. Such for instance, is the usage of *solemnis* for *solennis*; although this is not perhaps in all cases attributable to corruption." On the contrary I hold that there is in no case any corruption in writing *solemnis*.

"*Sollemnis et solemnus; solennis et sollennis*. Prima scriptura ap. vett. usitatio: in Virgilio illo vetusto semper occurrit, et aureo seculo Hortensii ac Ciceronis propria est; quamvis reliquæ tres propterea non spernendæ sint, quum sua non destituantur auctoritate. *Solemnis* antiqui Codd. et Inscriptt.; *solennis* et *sollennis* similiter in antiquis libris occurrunt. Si *solemnis* et *solennis* occurrunt, hæc censenda ratio, quod antiquissimi consonantes, præsertim liquidas, non geminarent. Schurzfl. Cell. Lips., Voss. Etym., Gottl. Korte Diss. 4. de Usu Orthographiæ Lat. c. 3. n. 17." Nolten. Lex. Anti-barbaro i, 168. Ed. 1780.

4. BOINTOX thus concludes:—"A late French Editor of Virgil, (who by the way is severe on the verbal errors of former editions, and on those of the Elzevir, we think, rather unjustly so,) has printed *Thybris* for *Tybris* throughout. Is this a Gallicism?"

I reply that there is more pedantry than Gallicism in the orthography.

Thybris, Gr. *Θύβρις*, auctoritate Dionysii increbuit; quod tamen timide usurpam; multo autem timidius, quod peiori ratione scribunt, *Tybris* sine spiritu. Apud Græcos i et ð varie permutantur." Nolten. l. c. 180. See Gesner's Thes. L. L. Forcellinus's Lex. totius Latinitatis. "Plin. iii. 5, *Tiberis*, antea *Tybris* adpellatus, et prius *Albulus*.—*Tybris* ἀπὸ τῆς ὑβρίας,

A. contumelia, vocatus ap. Serv. legitur. Contra *Thymbrim* potius dictum prædicat Dionys, P. 351.—Apud Steph: B. nomen amnis est Τέβρις, hodie *Tevere* nuncupatur." Oberlin. ad Vib. Sequestr. p. 203.

5. In the first *Nugæ*, (Class. Journ. xlviii. 384.) *ΒΟΙΝΤΟΣ* writes thus:—"The writer of the Life of Thomas Warton, in the London Magazine for Aug. N. 1794. p. 126. mentions the fact of Warton having in some Latin verses made the penultima of *cedrinæ* short, which he is inclined to consider as an error in quantity. This is a mistake: *cedrinus* is derived immediately from the Greek; and adjectives in *ινος*, expressive of the materials, of which any thing is made, have the penultima short. So Homer:

Κέδρινον, ὑψόροφον, ὃς γλήνεα πολλά κεχάνδει."

"*Cedrinus*, v. g. Oleum cedrinum, corripitur; descendit enim ab re inanimata." Nolten. l. c. 245.

On the adjectives terminating in *inus* Nolten. l. c. 3, 9—27. has treated largely and satisfactorily.

6. *ΒΟΙΝΤΟΣ*, if I mistake not, is the author of the interesting dissertation on the life and writings of Casimir, which adorns the xlixth No. of the Class. Journ. p. 103—110, and he may be gratified in perusing the following brief notice of Casimir, which is given by Nolten, l. c. ii. 2113:—

"Matthias Casimirus Sarbievius, Soc. Jesu, mort. 1640. Poeta Lyricus excellentissimus, alter Horatius; cujus Opera posthuma prodire Warsawi 1773. 8°. scr. *Orationes*; de Diis Gentium Libri iv. cet."

It is surprising that his name does not occur among the Casimirs enumerated by Hoffmann in Lex. Universali. The Bipont edition of Casimir's Odes is in my possession, and, when I have discovered its hiding place, I will supply the biographical and bibliographical information, which it may furnish in addition to what the diligence of your correspondent has given.

E. H. BARKER.

Thetford, April, 1822.

MARKLANDI NOTÆ MSS. IN EURIPIDEM.

WHEN I lately produced in the Cl. Jl. No. xlviii. p. 413, a long list of 70 conjectures, in which I had been anticipated by other scholars, I quoted two instances from the Preface and Appendix to my edition of the *Troades*, where the emendations

on Eurip. Orest. 67. and 409. had been, unknown to me, made by Markland also in some Mc. notes *penes me*. These I now feel myself bound to produce, with the view of avoiding all suspicion of having hazarded an untruth, the detection of which was almost impossible, by my appeal to evidence inaccessible to others. To be compelled thus to share with the public those treasures, which the possessor is generally anxious to keep entirely to himself, is really most annoying; a feeling which those persons alone can enter into, who are alive to all the delight conveyed by the words *penes me*, as applied to the *schedæ* of deceased scholars of no mean name. I ought to premise, that I transcribed the notes very hastily from the margin of a copy of King's Euripides, once in the possession of Matthew Raine, late Head-master of the Charterhouse, during the time of the sale of his library.

Emendationes magnam in partem ineditæ Marklandi, in Euripidis Hecubam, Orestem et Phænissas.

Numeri sunt ad editionem Beckianam.

20. ηὔρομην τάλας] q. (i. e. quære) καλός.
 83. νέον ἤξει τι] f. (i. e. fortasse) νέον γ' ἄρ' ἤξει μέλος.
 183. ψυχᾶς πέρι] q. ὕπερ.
 186. ἀναστένεις] q. ἀπύεις ut v. 156.
 225. ἀποσπασθῆς] f. ἀποσπάσης ut v. 281.
 241. φόνου] f. φόβου [quomodo ipse Markl. præcepit ad Suppl. 586. quam conjecturam pro sua venditat Porson.]
 288. [Citat] Schol. ad Theocrit. Id. ζ. 101.
 301. ὑφ' οὐπερ] f. ὑφ' οὗ ποτ' vel τότ'
 310. ἀνῆρ] f. ἄν ἦ. 367. ἐλευθέρον] q. ἐλευθέρων
 395. ἐφείλομεν] l. (i. e. lege) ὠφείλομεν.
 401. μιν] l. μιν. 425. ἀθλίαις] ἀθλία
 487. ἀλλάξας] q. ἀλλάξαιμ'
 617. ἀξίαν] l. ἀξία [uti Mss.]
 666. τοῖσι] l. σοῖσι [uti Ald.]
 807. γραφεύς τ' ἀποσταθεῖς] q. γραφῆς ἀποσταθεῖς,
 819. τυγχάνειν θ' ἄμα] q. φυγγάνειν θ', ἃ μή [scil. βούληται.]
 825, 6. versus spurii.
 834. ἐνός] l. κενός
 840. λόγους] q. γόους. 844. τῇ δίκη θ'] f. τῇ δίκη 'σθ'
 847. διαῤῥισαν] διχ' ὥρισαν, 856. τόνδε] f. τῶδε
 901. ἥσυχον] f. ἡσύχους [paulo aliter Elmsl. ad Heracl. 7. Addend.]
 974. τὶ καὶ νόμος] f. τι χ' ὦ νόμος
 1055. Θρηξι] f. θηρι

1071. πόδ'] q. ποτ': cf. Orest. 272. Hipp. 680.

1108. ζῶης] f. ζῆς vel βοῆς

In Orestem.

15. Vers. spurius.

28. μέν τί] q. ἐμὲ τί

34. ἀγρία—νόσω] q. ἀγρίαν—νότον

67. εἰσοδὸν ποτ'] f. ἐς ὁδὸν, εἴ ποτ' [ita G. B. ad Eurip. Tro. Præf. p. xxv.]

69. ῥώμης] q. ῥοπῆς: 86. σὺ δ' εἶ] f. σὺ δ' ὦ

101. ἔχει] f. σ' ἔχει. 122. ἐμὴν] ἐμὲ. 127. τε] f. τ' αὖ

129. ἐστὶν ἡ πάλαι γυνή.] Citat Plutarch. in Alcibiad. p. 203. D.

141. κτύπος] f. ψόφος.

179. δόμον] f. γόνον [ita Ms. apud Brunck.]

209. λέληθ' ὅδε] q. λάθῃ γ' ὅδε: vel εἰ pro μὴ ut Alc. 1108.

293. ἐγὼ δ' ἐγὼ θ' [ita Ms. apud Porson]

297. δεινὸν] f. δειλὸν. 386. δ' ὁρῶ] q. γ' ὁρῶν.

410. σεμναὶ γάρ· ἀπαίδευτον] q. σεμναὶ δ' ἀπαίδευτον γάρ

415. μὴ θάνατον εἶπες· τοῦτο μὲν γὰρ οὐ σοφόν.] f. μὴ θάνατον εἶπες πικρός· οὐ μὲν γὰρ σοφόν: sed non puto θάνατον fuisse a inanu Euripidis; potius μὴ τὸν θεὸν εἶπες. [G. B. ad Tro. App. p. 129. μὴ θεὸν τιν']

417. ἀμαθέστερος] l. ἀμαθῆς θεός γ' ὧν—vid. Schol.

418. εἰσὶν θεοί] f. εἰσὶν οἱ θεοί [ita Reisk.]

434. διὰ τριῶν] f. δι' ἐτέρων

542. ἐπισήμους] f. ἐπίσημ' ἐς

592. πᾶνθ' ὅσ' ἄν] f. πάντες, ἅ ἄν

688. πόνοισι] f. πλάνοισι

697. τις αὐτῷ] l. αὐτῷ τις [ita Brunck.]

725. ξυγκατασκάπτοις] f. ξυγκατασκήπτοις: vid. Med. 94.

735. εἰκότως] q. εἰκὸς ὡς [Seager in Cl. Jl. No. 39. p. 79. εἰκὸς ἦν]

753. θανεῖν] f. φθάνειν. 756. μάκρων] f. μικρῶν

773. εἰ λέγοιμ'] f. ὅ, τι λέγοιμ'

780. l. β'. α'. versibus transpositis.

902. ἡναγκασμένους] q. εἰσαγωγιμὸς: cf. Eurip. Erechth. Fragm. I. 10.

1051. ἀλλὰ τοῖς τάλαιπύροις] q. ἀμφοῖν τοῖν τάλαιπύροις

1091. τῇδ' ὁμοῦ.] q. τήνδ' ἐμοί.

1134. νῦν δ'—δώσει] f. ἦν δ'—δώσῃ

1172. κτανούσιν αὖ] Ms. κτανούσι μὴ· f. κτανεῦσιν ἢ

1174. τέρψω] f. τέρψαι [ita Porson.]

1188. μοι] q. νῶν

1222. δ' ἴσω στείχοντες] δι' συστείχοντες

1325. οὔσα δωμάτων] f. οὔσ' ὀδυρμάτων
 1360. συμφορᾶς] q. συμφορῶν
 1468. φυγᾶ δέ] q. φυγάδι [ita Stanl. et Facius.]
 1545. ἔχει] f. ἄγει [ita Blomfield. ad S. c. Th. 145.]
 1587. πράσσει] f. πράσσεις
 1589. παρὸν] f. πάρος [ita Markl. ipse ad Iph. A. 456.]
 1614. σοὶ σφάγιον] f. σὲ σφάγιον [ita Morell.]
 1624. ζῆν] f. ζῶν
 1681. καὶ σοῖς] f. σαῖσι,

In Phœnissas.

N.B. Quas Emendationes cum Burtono Marklandus communicavit, eæ exstant in Pentalogia Oxoniensi.

21. ἦλονῃ δούς] l. ἦλούς vel ἠλούς; vid. Schol. Aristoph. Ach. 242.
 86. βροτὸν] l. βροτῶν: Vid. Rhes. 106. et Lucian. advers. Indoct. p. 387. [Valek. quoque βροτῶν]
 96. πάρα,] q. πέρι,
 195. δώσειν] l. δώσει [ita Canter] 259. δέ] l. γὰρ
 368. αἰ—γοναί,] q. οἰ—πόννοι: vid. 30. Tro. 755. Suppl. 920. 1135. Lucian. Dial. p. 320. Plutarch. II. p. 496. D.
 374. τάρβους] l. τάρβος [ita Grot.]
 375. κτάνη,] q. φθάνη,
 391. σκότον δεδερκῶς] Vid. Bacch. 510. CEd. T. 427. Lucian de Luct. p. 305. Stat. Theb. I. 57.
 393. οὕτω γὰρ ἤρξατ', ἄνομα] f. οὕτως γὰρ ἤρξε τᾶνομ': vel ἐξῆρ' ἄνομα: coll. Hipp. 324.
 414. εἶχον ἄν.] f. εἶχον αὐ.
 461. καὶ ξυνωρίσας] f. τὰς ξυνωρίδας
 466. σοφόν.] f. σοφοῖς.
 487. καὶ τοῦδ', ἐκφυγεῖν] Schol. legisse videtur καὶ τόνδ' ἐκφυγεῖν
 492. φόνου] f. φθόνου. 511. μοι] f. τοι
 512. Citat Sext. Empiric. p. 18.
 515. ὀνομάσαι,] q. ὀνόματος vel ὀνόμασιν [uti Porson.]
 561. ἀπονέμειν;] l. ἀπονέμων;
 574. distingue ἐρεῖς, τυραννεῖν.
 612. κομπὸς] q. κομψὸς
 687. φόνος] q. φθόνος
 719. ὡς] q. ὡν. 727. πύργοις] q. λόχοις
 787. λαβόντα] q. ἄξοντα. vid. CEd. T. 1088.
 835. ἔτεκες—ἔτεκες] q. τίτεις—τίτεις
 898. νεκροῖς] q. νεκρῶν. 899. βέλη,] f. μέλ,
 972. μὲν] f. γὰρ. 984. κτείνων] κτείνειν
 1015. ὑπερθανεῖν] f. ὑπερθανῶν [ita Barnes. in marg.]
 1030, 1. Versus spurii.

1094. μὴ τρέσης τόδ',] q μὴ τρέσης, τοῦδ' [ita Porson.]
 1133. ἐπιτολαῖσιν] q. ἐπιτολαῖς ἦν
 1134. κρύπτοντα] q. κύπτοντα
 1196. κλίμακος] f. κλίμακας,
 1216. Cf. Herodot. ix. 19.
 1257. ἐμμένειν στρατηλάτας.] l. ἐμμενεῖν στρατηλάται.
 1275. εἴ τιν' ἀλκήν,] f. εἴ τ' ἀνάγκην,
 1282. δαιμόναν] f. δαίμονος
 1283. ἀνδρ' ἀρίστω] f. ἀνδρε δίσσω
 1358. ἀρχή] f. ἀρχη. [ita Barnes.]
 1375. αἰνιγμοῦς] l. αἰνιγμοῦ τ' [ita fere Scaliger]
 1447. ὅσον] f. ὅσα. 1432. Vers. spurius. [ita Valck.]
 1460. δύσπλητον] f. δύσλυτον [at δύσλυτον metro nocet.]
 1525. τάδ' αἵματά] f. τάδ' αἵματα
 1594. παισὶ] f. πασι. 1605. ἔβαψεν: cf. Ajac. 95.
 1606. τέκνοις.] q. νεκροῖς. c Schol.
 1654. ἐγὼ δὲ] f. ἐγὼ τε: vid. Hipp. 289. Ion. 573.
 1657. ἀλλοις] f. ὅπλοις [ita Reisk.]
 1665. 6. τὴν ἐπιούσαν ἡμέραν Μένουσ'] f. κάπιοῦσαν ἡμέραν Μει-
 νόν γ'.
 1667. ἀθλίους] l. ἀθλιοι cum Barnes. Vid. Alcest. 1038. Hel.
 803. Herc. F. 1393.
 1752. 3. δυστυχεστάτας φυγᾶς ἐλαύνει] l. δυστυχεστάταις φυγαῖς
 ἐλαύνων
 1778. ἐμοὶ] l. ἐμῶν.

G. B.

CRITICAL REMARKS

ON DR. OSANN'S EDITION OF PHILEMON.

P. 107. "R. W. in Mus. Crit. Cant. i. 199:—'Sapphonis versus ita disposuit Casaub. in Theophr. 140:

Τίς δ' ἀγριῶτις θέλγει νόον
 Οὐκ ἐπισταμένα τὰ βράκεια
 Ἐλκεν ἐπὶ τῶν σφυρῶν;

Negat Sappho posse cuiquam placere Andromedam, quæ rusticarum more vestem subductam gestet.' Quem magnum suæ omnisque ætatis Criticum in explicandis his Sapphonis verbis felicissimum fuisse, hic ipse Philemonis locus egregie demonstrat: Χρῆσις δὲ τοιαύτη παρὰ Σαπφοῖ ἐν τῷ, Τίς δ' ἀγριῶτις θέλγει νόον, οὐκ ἐπισταμένη τὰ βράκεια ἔλκεν ἐπὶ τῶν σφυρῶν, ἡγουν ποία γυνὴ χωριτικὴ, ἀγροικικώτερον ἐφέλκεται ἐραστήν; quo usus Ano-

nymus, [*Blomfield*,] in Mus. Crit. Cant. 1, 19. ἀγροῖωτιν nescio quibus de caussis reponi jussit, totò fragm. ita disposito: Τίς δ' ἀγροῖωτιν ἐπεμμένα στολὰν σοὶ θέλγει νόον, οὐκ ἐπισταμένα τὰ βράκεια ἔλκειν ἐπὶ τῶν σφυρῶν; At recte ἀγρειώτις habere, cujus loco Cod. leviter corruptus ἀγριώτης, unde Villosion. ἀγροιώτης, docent quæ interpretationis causa a Philemone adjecta sunt, γυνὴ χωριτική. Ceterum formæ Fem. ἀγρειώτις s. ἀγροιώτις Lexicis accedat. E Cod. editum ἀγροικιώτερον, quam vocem justa analogia carentem cave ne Lexicis addas. Repositum vocab. extat ap. Eumathli. 40. Lips."

1. The corrupt word ἀγροικιώτερον, which even Dr. Blomf. has failed to correct, also occurs in Phav., and it has been corrected in the *New Gr. Thes.* p. 686. c—7. a., where abundant examples of the genuine word are given, and where the fr. of Sappho is cited and discussed. In Eust. 1916., who quotes the very words of Philemon, we have ἀγροικιώτερον. 2. The passage of Philemon as quoted by Dr. Blomf. and edited by Osann, gives a meaning altogether foreign to the purpose of Sappho, ποῖα γυνὴ χωριτικὴ ἀγροικιώτερον ἐφέλκεται ἐραστήν; Where would be the miracle, if a country-girl excited the tender passion in the breast of a rustic youth? But the poetess says, and meant to say, What country-girl, dressed too much in the rustic fashion, would attract a lover's eye? Phay.: Ποῖα γυνὴ χωρητικὴ ἐξωσμένη ἀγροικιώτερον ἐφέλκεται ἐραστήν; Read, ποῖα—χωρητικὴ—ἀγροικιώτερον. As Phav. has transcribed Philemon, there can be no doubt that he found in his copy the word ἐξωσμένη, which must be restored to the latter, and which with a change in the punctuation will complete the sense. The whole passage is perfectly correct in Eust. l. c., (who has also transcribed Philemon :) Χρησις δὲ τοιαύτη παρὰ Σαπφοῖ ἐν τῷ, Τίς δ' ἀγροῖωτις θέλγει νόον, οὐκ ἐπισταμένη τὰ βράκεια ἔλκειν ἐπὶ τῶν σφυρῶν; ἤγουν ποῖα γυνὴ χωριτικὴ ἐξωσμένη ἀγροικιώτερον, ἐφέλκεται ἐραστήν; 3. Osann says that he knows not why Blomf. has introduced ἀγροῖωτιν for the vulgar reading ἀγροῖωτις. Dr. Blomf. found, as he himself states, in Max. Tyr. 8, 94. (p. 53. Heins.=24. p. 297. Davis.) Τίς δ' ἀγροῖωτιν ἐπεμμένα στολὴν, and he has therefore with great reason adopted ἀγροῖωτιν, because, if we read ἀγροῖωτις, the words ἐπεμμένα στολὴν, which on the authority of Max. Tyr. have a just right to their place in the fragment, would be absurd enough. 4. The words of Philemon ποῖα γυνὴ χωριτικὴ, introduced by way of explanation, do not necessarily imply that Philemon had found in his copy of Sappho, τίς δ' ἀγροῖωτις, because he might have used them, even if Sappho had said, Τίς δ' ἀγροῖωτιν ἐπεμμένα στολὰν, as that would have been but a periphrastic and poetic mode of describing a rustic

girl. 5. Phav. has ἀγριώτης, as in the Cod. of Philemon. 6. I agree with Osann in the propriety of, the compliment to Casaubon; and, while I admit that Cas. perceived the sense of the passage to consist in the ridicule of the rival Andromeda for the imitation of a rustic dress, I deny that he either read the passage correctly thus, Τῆς δ' ἀγριοῦταις θέλγει νόον, Οὐκ ἐπισταμένη τὰ βράκεια "Ἐλκεν ἐπὶ τῶν σφυρῶν, or translated it properly thus: "Moribus quædam male docta prorsus Rusticis mentem fovet atque mulcet, Quæ talos, nescit sinuosam' ad imos Ponere vestem." 7. I assent to Dr. Blonif.'s introduction of σοί, Σοί θέλγει νόον.

P. 184. "R. W. in Mus. Crit. Cant. 1, 199. 'Mercurius φηλητῶν ἀναξ, Eur. Rhés. 216. A v. φηλός, Gallicum Filou, Filouter, derivatum esse censet Cōray. Vossio, qui a φιλήτης Lat. Fallere deducit, adstipulatur T. II. in J. Poll. 19, 136.' Cf. Reiz. de Incl. Accent. 114." The words φηλήτης, φιλήτης, φιλητής, have been illustrated by me in a Ms. Letter, addressed to the learned Professor Lennep of Amsterdam, and a part of the matter contained in it is cited in the *Lex. Vocc. peregr.*, prefixed to the *New Gr. Thes.* p. ccclxvi. and further observations may be found in *Epist. Cr. ad Gaisford.*, in the *Classical Journal*.

P. 226. "In transcurso Hesychii Glossam emendo: 'Αγασίς· ὁ φθόνος, σφαῖρα: quæ postrema vox cum ἔχθρα commutanda videtur; quam conjecturam iis, qui Mss. tractarint, non temerariam spero visuram. Eadem vox etiam alibi male irrepsit, sine hæsitazione expellenda ex Etym. G. 21, 19. collatis Hes. v. Αἶρα 1, 168. cum Alberti nota, Larchero ad Orion. Etym. 67., et Sturzio ibid. 185." P. 226. If Osann will turn to the *New Gr. Thes.* p. 120. c. and 130. a. b., he will find that H. Steph. had also suspected the genuineness of the word σφαῖρα in this Gloss, but that the Editors by the aid of Is. Vossius have vindicated its propriety by shewing that Hesychius has confounded "Αγασίς· ὁ φθόνος, with 'Αγασίς· ἡ σφαῖρα, Dorice pro 'Αγαθίς, ut 'Αγασός Dorice pro 'Αγαθός, Aristoph. A. Semler in a tract, for the loan of which I am indebted to my friend Mr. Dobree, and which bears this title: *Notitiam splendidissimæ Lexici Hesychiani Edit., quæ inter Batavos prodire cepit cura S. R. Viri Jo. Alberti, Theol. Doctoris et Prof. Publ. in Academia LB., exhibet, et Specimen Animadversionum addit J. S. S. Salf. Thuringus, Halæ 1749.* 12°. writes thus in p. 35:—"Sopingius: Forte δ' κύων Βρεταννικός. Vossius: 'Αγασίς· φθόνος. 'Αγαθίς· σφαῖρα. Conjicimus: 'Αγασίη· φθόνος, φθονερά. Φθρα fuit compendio scripturæ. Nempe forma duplici, nomen et adj." But this kind of

double emendation should always be received with great suspicion, more particularly when it introduces into the Greek language a new word, of which no traces can be discovered in any other place. Explanation is at all times a wiser and safer plan of criticism than emendation.

P. 234. "Lex. ined. SGM. Cod. Par. Reg. 177. fol. 11. recto: 'Ἀμύνεσθαι' Θουκυδίδης μὲν ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀμείβεσθαι, Σιμωνίδης δὲ ἀντὶ τοῦ χάριτας ἀποδιδόναι, Σοφοκλῆς δὲ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀπαλεξῆσαι. Κυρίως γοῦν τὸ ἀμύνεσθαι ἐπὶ τῶν προηδικημένων καὶ ἐς μάχην μετὰ τοῦτο κέκινημένων λέγεται· ἀμύνω δὲ ἐνεργητικῶς τὸ βοηθῶ, καὶ ἀμύνειν ἀντὶ τοῦ βοηθεῖν." In Zonaras this Gloss is thus written: 'Ἀμύνεσθαι' Θουκυδίδης μὲν ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀμείβεσθαι, Σιμωνίδης δὲ ἀντὶ τοῦ χάριτας ἀποδοῦναι, Σοφοκλῆς δὲ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀπαλεξῆσαι. 'Επὶ τῶν προηδικηκότων τάσσουσιν οἱ ῥήτορες τὸ ἀμύνεσθαι, ὅτε οἱ κακόν τι παθόντες ἀντιπράττουσι τοὺς * προδιατιθέντας. See the Note of Tittmann.

E. H. BARKER.

Thetford, April, 1822.

NOTICE OF

The LYRICS of HORACE; being the First Four Books of his ODES. Translated by the REV. FRANCIS WRANGHAM, M.A. F.R.S. Lond. 8vo.

OF all the ancient writers, none have been so often or so generally translated in all languages as Horace. His Odes form the first essay of young poets, and grey-headed scholars find one of their chief and most rational amusements in reading, reciting, and translating his works. We have more translations in the English language, of Horace, than of any other Classic. They extend from the Poetical Corner of a newspaper, and the Select Poetry of a magazine, to complete versions of all his writings. Some of our greatest poets have employed their talents in translating or imitating him, and have proved the truth of the general observation, that the oftener Horace is read, the more his beauties are unfolded to our view.

Mr. Wrangham, who is most respectably known to the literary world as an eminent scholar and an elegant writer, has, "during moments of comparative leisure," occasionally amused himself in translating some of the Odes. By degrees, the number has been increased to the present collection, and we trust that he will find sufficient encouragement to complete the trans-

lation. His attempt will bear a most favorable comparison with the translation of Francis, which we consider as the most correct of all. In originality of style, Mr. Wrangham has, in our opinion, surpassed his predecessors, and has given a specimen of what Horace would have written, had he written in English. He has "deemed it his duty, wherever it could be done without obscurity, to adopt several of the Horatian inversions, and almost invariably to preserve his lyrical implications of one stanza with another." Hence the English reader will form a more accurate idea of Horace from this than from any other translation.

We are not sure, however, that his translation would not have been improved by some variety of metre. He has confined himself to the octosyllabic metre; but we think that an ode, so affecting and sublime as the 28th of the first Book, would have derived additional grace from the heroic measure. A critic as fastidious as Gilbert Waketield would object to some of Mr. Wrangham's rhymes, as he did to those of Pope. And perhaps in preparing another edition, the Translator will review such rhymes as *anticipate, complete; was, embrace; war, wantoner*.

We have not room for much quotation. We shall give, as a short specimen, the 32d ode of the first book:

O IF my hand in idle play
 E'er won from thee a deathless lay,
 Now at this call, thou glorious Lyre,
 The Latian song awake, inspire.
 Thy chords of yore Alcæus strung:
 But whether his sweet accents rung
 Amid the raging battle's roar,
 Or with his tost keel moor'd on shore;
 The Muses, Wine, the Queen of Joy,
 And ever at her side her Boy
 He sang: nor, Lyce, pass'd he by
 Thy long dark hair and darker eye.

O Lyre, Apollo's loveliest grace,
 Who find'st in Jove's high festals place;
 Soft soother of each toil, each care,
 O list thy poet's solemn prayer!

We agree with Mr. Wrangham in his "distrust of the genuineness of the original" in two passages. One is easily omitted with great improvement to the sense, and without violation of the metre; the other is so interwoven with the metre, that it must be left in possession of its rights.

We hope Mr. W: will proceed to the Satires and Epistles.

DIOGENES LAERTIUS,
a Patre an à Patria sic vocatus sit?

MR. G. Burges in his article "on the fables of Æsop and Babrias," in *Class. Journ.* xlix. 20, calls Diog. L. simply by the name of *Laertius*, and, as other scholars are in the habit of so calling this writer, it will perhaps be worth while to lay before your readers some remarks, which I made on this subject, in a notice of the *Mus. Crit. Cantabr.* No. 1. which appeared in the *Brit. Crit. for Oct.* 1813. p. 404:—

"In p. 84. we were surprised to find Diog. L. called simply *Laertius*, though his claim to that distinction is no more than that of *Diod.* to the appellation of *Siculus*: it is, however, a mistake, which has been frequently made. Let us listen to J. A. Fabr. *Bibl. Gr.* 5, 564:—

"Sunt qui a patre Laerte vocatum contendant, ut [Heumanus,] H. Vales. Exc. Peiresc. 41. *Diogenes, Laertii filius, scribit* etc. quo sensu Ulysses possit dici *Laertius*, (ab Ovid. *Trist.* v, 6, 3.) qui Homero Il. B. *Λαερτιάδης, Laertæ filius, Διογενὲς Λαερτιάδης, πολυμήχαν' Ὀδυσσεῦ.* Et ap. Pind. de Bello Trojano Laertes ipse, Ulyssis pater, *Laertius* adpellatur: *Bello Laertius atrox.* Vicissim Diog. noster Eustathio ad Il. M. p. 854. dicitur ὁ Λαέρτης. Alterius Q. Laertii, sub Augusto Imperatore clari, mentio in vet. Inscr. ap. Gruter. p. 299. Sive leg. *Lartius*, ut 99. 191., quod idem nomen est. *C. Laertius Sabinianus* in alia vet. Inscr. ap. Fabrett. 351. Porro *Λαέρτιος* pro patronymico, a Laerta, Ciliciæ urbe, usurpatum, (non minus quam *Λαερτικὸς* ap. Gal. de S. M. 7. Tom. 2. p. 89. Bas., vel *Λαερτίτης*, ut in Eust. l. c. rescribebat, præter mentem Eustathii, ut existimo, T. Faber, vel *Λαερτιεύς*,) quin elegantius etiam dici, quam *Λαερτινός*, quod solum isto in loco memorat, testatur Steph. B. v. *Λαέρτης*. Eidem in *Χολλίδαι* laudatur Diog. noster ὁ Λαέρτιεύς ἐν δευτέρῳ Φιλοσόφου Ἱστορίας, qui locus, ni sit corruptus, Laertium a patria sic dictum esse, cum viris doctissimis mihi persuadeo. [Heum. in *Actis Philos.* P. 5. c. 3. p. 854. et Longol. in *Præf.* ad Edit. ipsius p. 4. sqq.]

"So well satisfied as to the fact was Vossius, that, as Fabr. observes, he frequently calls Diog. by the name of *Laertiensis*, de *Arte Gramm.* p. 11. etc."

Thetford, April 1822.

E. II. BARKER.

NUGÆ.

No. III.—[Continued from No. XLIX. p. 11.]

HAVING referred to Milton's historical work, we may here take the opportunity of quoting two other passages, on account of the resemblance (however originating) which the circumstances recorded in them bear to others in ancient history. The first occurs in the history of the Saxon King Athelstan, and resembles the traditions concerning Hecuba, the wife of Cyrus, &c.

"The song went in Malmsbury's days (for it seems he refused not the authority of ballads for want of better) that his mother was a farmer's daughter, but of excellent feature; who dreamt one night she brought forth a moon that should enlighten the whole land; which the King's nurse hearing of, took her home and bred up courtly; that the King coming one day to visit his nurse, saw there this damsel, liked her, and by earnest suit prevailing, had by her this famous Athelstan." p. 267.

The other relates to the murder of Athelwold by King Edgar, an act of which the historian speaks with an indulgence which is highly edifying.

"It chanced that the earl's base (illegitimate) son coming by upon the fact, the King sternly asked him how he liked this game; he submissly answering, that whatsoever pleased the King, must not displease him; the King returned to his wonted temper, took an affection to the youth, and ever after highly favored him, making amends in the son for what he had done to the father." Compare Herod. iii. 34, 35. Λέγεται γὰρ εἰπεῖν αὐτὸν πρὸς Πηρξάσπεα, τὸν ἐτίμα τε μάλιστα, καὶ οἱ τὰς ἀγγελίας ἐφάρεε οὗτος, τούτῳ τε ὁ παῖς οἰνοχόος ἦν τῷ Καμβύσῃ, τιμὴ δὲ καὶ αὕτη οὐ σμικρὴ· εἰπεῖν δὲ λέγεται τάδε· "Πηρξάσπες, κοῖον μὲ τίνα νομίζουσι Πέρσαι εἶναι ἄνδρα; τίνας τε λόγους περὶ ἐμέο ποιεῦνται;" Τὸν, δὲ εἰπεῖν· "ὦ δέσποτα τὰ μὲν ἄλλα πάντα μεγάλας ἐπαινεῖαι· τῇ δὲ φιλοινίῃ σέ φασι πλεόνως προσκίεσθαι." Τὸν μὲν δὴ λέγειν ταῦτα περὶ Περσέων, τὸν δὲ, θυμωθέντα, τοιάδῃ ἀμείβεσθαι·—"Σὺ νῦν μάθε αὐτὸς, εἰ λέγουσι Πέρσαι ἀληθέα, εἴτε αὐτοὶ λέγοντες ταῦτα παραφρονέουσι. εἰ μὲν γὰρ τοῦ παιδὸς τοῦ σοῦ τοῦδε, ἔστεῳτος ἐν τοῖσι προθύροισι, βαλὼν τύχοιμι μέσης τῆς καρδίας, Πέρσαι φανέονται λέγοντες οὐδέν· ἦν δὲ ἁμάρτω, φάναι Πέρσας τε λέγειν ἀληθέα, καὶ μὲ μὴ σωφρονέειν." Ταῦτα δὲ εἰπόντα, καὶ διατείναντα τὸ τόξον, βάλεειν τὸν παῖδα· πεσόντος δὲ τοῦ παιδὸς, ἀνασχίζειν αὐτὸν κελεύειν, καὶ σκέψασθαι τὸ βλῆμα· ὡς δὲ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ εὐρεθῆναι ἐνεόντα τὸν διστόν, εἰπεῖν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα τοῦ παιδὸς, γιγίσαντα, καὶ περιχαρέα γενόμενον· "Πηρξάσπες, ὡς μὲν ἐγὼ γε οἶ

μαίνομαι, Πέρσαι τε παραφρονέουσι, δηλά ται γέγονε· νῦν δέ μοι εἶπε, τίνα εἶδες ἤδη πάντων ἀνθρώπων οὕτως ἐπίσκοπα τοξεύοντα ;” Πρῆξά-
 πεα δὲ ὁρέοντα ἄνδρα οὐ φρένῃρεα, καὶ περὶ ἑωυτῷ δειμαίνοντα, εἰπῆιν·
 “ Δέσποτα, οὐδ’ ἂν αὐτὸν ἔγωγε δοκῶ τὸν θεὸν οὕτω ἂν καλῶς
 βαλέειν.”

We remember, in Mosheim’s *Ecclésiastical History*, an account of a somewhat similar atrocity, ascribed to a fanatical or seditious demagogue of the middle ages, to which Mosheim refuses belief, on the ground of its inherent improbability. History, however, proves that such have been the favorite diversions of tyrants of all kinds, and in all ages ; nor is there any thing more incredible in such enormities, than in the new and refined modifications of vice related to have been introduced under the Roman emperors. It is better to draw a lesson from such examples, than to deny their existence.

It is observable that Milton in this work calls the ancient inhabitants of the island *Britans* ; an orthography certainly more classical than the received one. We much question, indeed, whether there is any ancient authority whatever for the name *Briton*, as applied to the natives of Britain. Some of our old authors write the word *Britains*.—A modern writer, proposing a reform (*absit invidia dicto*) in our orthography, lays down the practice of Milton as the standard by which it should be regulated ; we do not now recollect whether he limits his proposed change to the language of poetry, or extends it to prose. If this suggestion did not come, as we fear it does, a century too late, it might be worth attending to.

In a note to p. 344 of the XLVIth No. of the *Journal*, it is observed, “ With the rude luxury, somewhat of the customs and polity of the old heroic times might seem to have been preserved among the Thessalians.” It is remarkable also, that many of the old heroic names remained in use among them ; as Jason, Polydamas, (*Hom. and Xen. Hell.*) Orestes, (*Thuc. I.*) Menon, (*Hom. Il. XII. Thuc. II. and Xen. Anab. II.*) Lycophron, (*Hom.*) &c.

Blomfield on *Æsch. Agam.* 636. (*ἐν νυκτὶ δυσκύμαντα δ’ ὠράρει* (al. *ὠρόρει*) *κακά*, observes, “ *Æschylum formam Homericam adoptasse crediderim.*” Perhaps the same remark may be applied to the passage of Sophocles, (*τοῦ Ὀμηρικωτάτου*) quoted immediately before, *Œd. Col.* 1622, *οὐδ’ ἔτ’ ὠράρει βοή*.—In the references to Erfurdt and Elmsley, at the end of the note on l. 515, there is evidently some mistake.

Mitford’s *Hist. of Greece*, Vol. x. p. 454, note 3. “ *Τὰ ἱερὰ τοῖς θεοῖς ἐπιθεῖς, ἐμφαγὼν, διὰ νυκτὸς ἐπύρρεξεν*.—The pretended

translation of this passage runs thus : ' *Sacris operatus, cibum sumsit avidius. Hinc nocte febre tentatus est.*' The translators, by the insertion of the utterly unauthorised words *avidius* and *Hinc*, have been guilty of nothing less than a most impudent and malicious forgery." (So in the preceding page, Gronovius's "inadvertency nearly equals his malice and arrogance.") This is in the very spirit of Gifford's vindications of Ben Jonson. We know not which to admire more, the historian's confidence in his own scholarship, or the indignation with which he repels so venial a charge against the memory of Alexander the Great, as that of eating a hearty supper. There are three points in which Mr. Mitford is deficient : a critical knowledge of the Greek language—a more intimate familiarity with ancient literature in general—and a deeper insight into the Greek national character. His work is a most valuable one, and calculated to dispel a cloud of delusions which have prevailed on the subject to which it relates ; but it is not complete. In the Quarterly critique of his fifth volume, (the work apparently of a philosophical and enlightened writer,) his want of enlarged views, as well as some other faults, are animadverted on. "His mind," says the Reviewer, "is acute, and his patience unwearied, in investigating the probable truth or falsehood of an asserted event ; but it does not possess that enlargement of inquiry, and that vividness of imagination which can present the results of its researches in one luminous point of view, and collect the scattered rays of insulated facts, till they converge into an image of truth for the delight and instruction of mankind." The critic, however, is unnecessarily severe on Mr. Mitford's style ; the passages which he has adduced as specimens of harshness of style, are extreme instances, and (we believe) have few parallels in the volume under review : nor, perhaps, has he given his author sufficient credit for the manly plainness of his style—a style which we are almost disposed to prefer to that of Gibbon. Having mentioned the article in the Quarterly, we take the opportunity of recommending a late paper in the British Critic, either by the same or a congenial hand, on Bekker's Thucydides.

E Miltoni Como.

ὦ Χαῖρε Πίστις, ὀρθὸν ὀφθαλμοῖς αἶσι
 βλέπουσα, καὶ σὺ χερσὶ λευκοπήχεσι
 πτεροῖς τε λαμπρὰ χρυσέοις, πομπὸς θεῶν,
 Ἐλπίς, τρίτῃ δ' ἄδικτον Ἀγνότης δέμας,

ὑμᾶς ἐναργεῖς εἰσορῶ· πέποιθα δὲ
 τὸν πατέρα τὸν μέγιστον, ὥτε πᾶν κακὸν
 ὡς δοῦλός ἐστι, ποίημός θ' ὑπηρέτης,
 πέμψειν ἄρωγόν, ἣν δέη, λευκόπτερον,
 ψυχῆς τε τῆσδε σώματός τ' ἀμύντορα.
 ἔσαινέ μ' ἔλπις, ἣ μελάγχχιμον νέφος
 ἔτειν' ἐς ὄρφνῃν ἀργυρᾷ πεπλώματα;
 ἔσαινέ μ' οὐδέν' ὡς μελάγχχιμον νέφος
 τείνει πρὸς ὄρφνῃν ἀργυρᾷ πεπλώματα,
 λεπτόν τε βάλλει φέγγος ἐν δένδροις πυκνοῖς.
 οὐ μοι πάρεστιν ἐπὶ κασιγνητοῖς βοᾶν·
 ὅμως δ', ὅσον περ χάζομαι πορρωτάτῳ
 ἀκουστὸν αὐδᾶν, τλήσομ' (ὀτρύνει νέα
 ψυχὴ μ' ἐβ') οἱ δ' ἄπεισιν οὐκ ἴσως μακράν.

Ἀναπαιστοί.

Ἀχὼ τερπνὰ, πολὺ τερπνίστα
 νυμφᾶν Ἀχὼ,
 ἀεὶ ῥὶ βαίνουσ', ἀπροσόμιλος,
 χ' ἄ δῃ τ' ὀχθαῖς παρὰ ποιονόμους
 Φρυγίου ποταμοῦ, ρεύμασιν ἄργοῦ,
 καὶ λειμῶνας κατ' ἰσπεράνους,
 κόγχην ναίεις πολύφωνον·
 ἐνθα πόθῳ σοι ξυντακομένα
 παννυχία πικρὸν ὕμνον ἀηδῶν
 αἰδὺ λιγαίνει·
 εἰπέ μοι, εἰπέ μοι, εἴ τι που εἶδες
 τοῖν διογενοῖν τινὰ συντροφίαν,
 σὺ Ναρκίσσῳ προσομοίαν;
 εἰ δ' αὖ σφ' ἀντρῶ που ὑπ' ἀνθοκόμῳ
 ἔκρυψας, δεῖξον μόνον, ὃ Λέσχας
 ἔποχ', αἰθερίου θυγάτερ κύκλου·
 μισθὸν δὲ θεῶν οἴκου μετέχοις,
 σὺ δ' ἀμοιβαία
 θειαῖς προσθῇ χάρις ᾠδαῖς.

Milton, Par. Reg. II. 69. (soliloquy of Mary)
 While I to sorrows, am no less advanc'd,
 And fears as eminent, above the lot
 Of other women; by the birth I bore, &c.

From Houn. II. Σ. 428.

— — — ἡ ἄρα δὴ τις, ὅσαι θεαὶ εἰς' ἐν Ὀλύμπῳ,
 τοστὰδ' ἐνὶ φρεσὶν ἦσιν ἀνέσχετο κήδνα λυγρὰ, κ. τ. λ.

Ib. 454. sq. Riches — more apt
 To slacken virtue; &c. •

Apt has here the sense of the Latin *aptus*. So III. 196.

— — — just trial ere I merit

My exaltation — i. e. *earn*; the Latin *mereri*.

Thus *instrument*, 387; *curious*, IV. 42; *appearing*, ib. 99.
 We notice these Latinisms, as not immediately obvious. In the
 conclusion of the angelic song, IV. 629.

Hail, Son of the most High, heir of both worlds,
 Queller of Satan — — — — —

Milton may seem to have had in view the titles of honor, with
 which the Roman soldiers in their acclamations after a victory
 saluted their triumphant commander.

— I. 488.

Who ever by consulting at thy shrine
 Return'd the wiser, or the more instinct
 To fly or follow what concern'd him most, &c.

See the celebrated reply of Cato to Labienus, in the IXth
 Book of Lucan, "Quid quæri, Labiene, jubes?" &c.

— III. 172.

— — — Zeal and Duty are not slow,
 But on Occasion's forelock watchful wait.
 They themselves rather are occasion best,
 Zeal of thy Father's house, duty to free
 Thy country from her heathen servitude.

Milton seems to have had in view Homer's Εἰς οἰωνὸς ἀρίστος, κ.
 τ. λ. — The description of Satan's disguise in Book I. 314.

— — — an aged man in rural weeds,
 Following, as seem'd, the quest of some stray ewe,
 Or wither'd sticks to gather, which might serve
 Against a winter's day, when winds blow keen,
 To warm him wet return'd from field at eve —

is a more close copy of Homer's manner than any thing else in
 Milton. Throughout the greater part of the poem, however,
 an imitation of the *gnomic* passages of the later Greek poets is
 more visible. This resemblance is more striking than even in

the *Paradise Lost*. See I. 400: ib. 409, &c. Samson, l. 288. 1292, ought perhaps to be pointed thus:

He all their armimuntion
And feats of war defeats;
With plain heroic magnitude of mind
And celestial vigor *arm'd*

Their *armories* and magazines contemn.

Thus the opposition between the two similar words is made more manifest, as in l. 1289, and again in the same passage, l. 1282—3; so Par. L. 1. “highly they rag’d against the Highest.” Samson, l. 1361.

————— who knows how he may report
Thy words by adding fuel to the flame?

A classical inversion: “add fuel—by reporting.”

———— l. 1581.

by whom fell he?

What glorious hand gave Samson his death’s wound?

Æn. XII. 322.

————— *pressa est insignis gloria facti,*
Nec sese Æneæ jactavit vulnere quisquam.

(where, by the way, we do not consider *gloria* is ironically intended.)

R. M.

NOTICE OF

ILLUSTRATIONS OF HOGARTH; i. e. Hogarth illustrated from passages in authors he never read, and could not understand.—NICHOLS and SON.

WE once heard an eccentric friend speak of Hogarth as “the greatest poet of the last century.” By this was meant, that Hogarth had the faculties of a poet, and that the degree of poetical power, developed in his pictures, was greater than any thing discoverable in the works of contemporary versemen. Hogarth’s knowledge, both of the *meteorology* of the human heart, (if the term may be used,) and of its inner recesses; his possession of that chemic faculty by which realities are transmuted into poetry; the under current of energy and feeling, which is visible throughout his mirth, and which, to the eye of a true critic, distinguishes him from the ordinary painter of low life; his pathetic and his terrific powers, have been vindicated and illustrated by abler pens than ours.

It is, however, more particularly in his character of satirical moralist, and painter of manners, that the present author, or compiler, has compared Hogarth with the ancient poets

of Rome. We extract part of the Preface, as illustrating the design of the work, and its origin; although the explanation given of the latter, is itself somewhat enigmatical.

Underneath the Print in Hogarth's Works called "The Discovery," is this Motto,

"Qui color albus erat, nunc est contrarius albo."

The pursuit of this idea has produced the following collection.

Dr. Jortin tells us, "Dr. Thirlby was once resolved to publish Shakspeare, and persuaded him, Jortin, to read over that poet with a view to mark the passages where he had either imitated Greek and Latin writers, or at least fallen into the same thoughts and expressions. Many of these allusions or coincidences," continues Jortin, "appeared; but Thirlby dropped his design, and I mine."²

It is much to be lamented that such a design came to nothing when it had got into hands so able. It appears as if Dr. Jortin had a higher opinion of the learning of Shakspeare than has been entertained subsequently to the year 1766, when Dr. Farmer published his first essay on the subject.

On the learning of Hogarth, or, more properly speaking, on his want of it, there never has been more than one opinion: it may be seen throughout Nichols's "Biographical Anecdotes of Hogarth."³

Dr. Johnson, in his life of Prior, says, it is not always easy to determine whether similitudes proceed from accident or imitation.

In the present case the difficulty is at an end; and the employment is not displeasing, thus to remark the coincidences of thoughts written at such distant periods⁴ by persons who could not possibly imitate each other.

Swift, in his "Rhapsody on Poetry," says,

"Commentators view

In Homer, more than Homer knew."

The same that has thus been said of Poets, may be said of Painters—*ut Pictura Poesis*,—and for the same reason: both draw from Nature. Without this clue, the coincidences already mentioned would be inexplicable—coincidences of thought, written at periods so distant from each other as those of Aristotle and Hogarth; especially when we know it was wholly impossible that the latter could imitate the former.

The education of Hogarth was so confined, that it left him deficient in common orthography; in other words, he could not spell.

Under disadvantages thus obvious, such was the fire, such the native genius of Hogarth, that he has delineated, clothed, and embodied the ideas of almost every Roman poet, before, after, and at the Augustan age.

He has done more: as Dr. Warton says,⁵ in the first volume of his "Essay on Pope," the works of Hogarth have more of what the Ancients called the *ἦθος* in them, the *Mores*, the *Morum proprietates*, than the composition of any other modern whatsoever.

"*Præcipuus ad notandos mores*,"⁶ are the words of Quintilian on Ho-

¹ Ovid. Metam. ii. 541.

² Jortin's Tracts, vol. II. p. 526.

³ Third Edit. 8vo, pp. 55-56, 86, 361, 374: 4to, vol. I. pp. 234, 363. vol. II. 206, 244.

⁴ The period here spoken of exceeds 2000 years. Aristotle lived 300 years before Christ, and Hogarth died in 1764.

⁵ See Vol. I. page 122, 123. And see Nichols's 8vo, p. 65; 4to, vol. I. p. 267.

⁶ Quint. a Rollin, Lib. X. cap. I. § VI. 1. p. 379.

race: they are not more applicable to him than they are to Hogarth. To him we are indebted, as Swift and Cicero say of Homer, for more than he did or *could perceive*:" "Qui focus, quæ species formæ, qui motus Hominum, qui Mulierum non ita expectatus est, ut, quæ *Ipsæ non viderit*, nos ut videremus efficerit."¹ The objects are before the spectator's eyes; the ideas, many times his own,

—"Sunt oculis subjecta fidelibus, et quæ
Ipsæ sibi tradit spectator."²

The pictures, "Narrationes credibiles; nec historico, sed quotidiano sermone explicatæ dilucide."³

Our author has accordingly *illustrated* several of Hogarth's principal performances, by centos of passages from the different Latin writers, exhibiting the correspondences above alluded to.

We have room only for the following extracts, which we leave to the judgment of our readers; observing, that the commentary might perhaps be enlarged with some advantage. Our first quotation shall be from the "Harlot's Progress."

Thesis, or Subject:

Ingenia et mores Meretricum.⁴

Exordium:

Plate I. Five Figures.

——— Mulier quædam abhinc triennium

*Eloraco*⁵ commigravit huc viciniam;

Inopia, et cognatorum negligentia⁶

Coacta, egregia forma atque ætate integra.

Primum, hæc pudice vitam parce ac duriter

Agebat, lana ac tela victum quarritans;

Plate II. Five Figures:

Sed postquam Amans accessit, pretium pollicens,

Unus, et *item alter*,⁷—

Acceptit conditionem.

Plate III.:

(Nunc,⁸ instructa pulchre ad perniciem

Victim vulgo quarere) quæstum occipit.

Harum⁹ videre inlucem, sordes, inopiam;

Quam *inbonestæ*¹⁰ solæ sint domi, atque avidæ cibi,

Quo pacto *ex jure hesterno*¹¹ panem atrum vorent!

Plate IV. Eleven Figures:

Hinc,¹² in Pistrinum, est recta proficisci via.

Plate V. Six Figures:

Jam—ferme moriens,¹³

¹ Cicero de Homero *cæco*. V. Tusc. Quæst. 5, p. 4579. Edit. Lutetiae, Dupuis, 1573.

² Hor. Ars Poet. 181.

³ Cicero. V. Prescott on Horace, Cambridge, 1773, p. 222.

⁴ Orig. "Ex Andro." ⁵ Ter. Eun.

⁶ See the direction on the Goose—"For my Cousin."

⁷ See the Print, Fig. 2, with the Maid. ⁸ Ter. Heaut. Act. III. S. 1.

⁹ Ter. Eun. Act. V. S. 4.

¹⁰ See the Watch.

¹¹ East night's Porter.

¹² Ter. And. Act. III. S. 4.

¹³ Ter. And. Act. I. S. 5.

Volnus alit venis et cæco carpitur igni.¹

Catastrophe;

Plate VI. Thirteen Figures.

Vivit Gnatus;

Matrem ipsam, ex ægritudine *hæc*,

Miseram, Mors consecuta est.²

Scene.

Mœrentes, flentes, lacrumantes, et miserantes.³

Epilogus.

Ex hæc, heu! quanti et quantâ sua fœdera vendunt!⁴

Ut⁵ flos in septis secretis nascitur hortis, &c.

NUGÆ CRITICÆ.

IN the xlviiith number of this Journal, p. 337, Mr. Taylor, in quoting the following words of Proclus, ἀνέπλωσε δὲ ταῖς ἑαυτοῦ καθαρωτάταις ἐπιβολαῖς ὁ τῶν Πλατωνι μὲν συμβαλλέυστας ὡς ἀληθῶς καὶ ὁ μέστος καταστάς τῆς θείας ἀληθείας τῆς δὲ θεωρίας ἡμῖν γενομένος ταύτης ἡγεμῶν καὶ τῶν θείων τούτων λογῶν οὕτως ἱεροφαντῆς, observes, that ὁ μέστος is evidently erroneous, and testifies that an Harleian Ms. reads ὁμοστῖος: from which Mr. T. elicits ὁμοστεγος. The true reading is, perhaps, ὁμοέστιος. Mairanus p. 20=8. uses the expression ὁμοέστιον συνεχῶς ποιῆσθαι.

In the same No., p. 348, the following passage is quoted from Livy, iii. 5, “ Interim in castris Furius consul, quum primo quietus obsidionem passus esset, in incautum hostem decumana porta erupit; et, quum persequi posset, metu substitit, ne qua, ex parte altera, in castra vis fieret. Furium legatum, frater idem consulis erat, longius extulit cursus; nec suos ille redeuntes, persequendi studio, neque hostium ab tergo incursum vidit. Ita exclusus, multis sæpe frustra conatibus captis, acriter dimicans cecidit. Et consul, nuncio circumventi fratris, *conversus ad pugnam*, dum se temere magis quam satis caute, in mediam dimicationem infert, vulnere accepto, ægre ab circumstantibus ereptus, et suorum animos turbavit, et hostes ferociores, fecit; qui cæde legati et consulis vulnere accensi, nulla deinde vi sustineri potuere, *quum* compulsi in castra Romani rursus considerentur, nec spe nec viribus pares; venissetque in periculum

¹ Virgil. *Æn.* IV. 2.

² Ter. *Phorm.* Act. V. S. 1. Vide Donatum in verbum *Hæc*.

³ Inter Ennii Fragment. Vide Prescott on Horace, 212.

⁴ Juvenal, VIII. 192.

⁵ Catallus, LX.

summa rerum, ni T. Quinctius *peregrinus copiis* cum Latino Hernicoque exercitu subverisset."

The three correspondents D. B. H., J. W., and M., have written much on this difficult passage; but, like most writers of the present day, throw little light on critical subjects. In the words, printed in Italics, the whole difficulty exists, and by the following easy emendations, will be done totally away; read therefore,—*at—cum reversus ad pugnandum—quin—peregre. nec opius*,—

The antithesis requires *at*.

Sound sense requires that mention be made of the *return* of the Consul, who had retired, to renew the fight.

The rules of correct Latinity demand, after the negative *nulla vi potuere*, the particle *quin*.

Lastly, to omit all mention of T. Quinctius coming *quickly* to the relief of the camp, reduced to the greatest straits, would prove Quinctius no general and Livy no historian.

X.

N. B. If these emendations be the property of any preceding scholar, I beg that I may be added to the other plagiarists of the present times.

OBSERVATIONS ON

Some of the notes in the late MR. DALZEL'S Collectanea Græca Majora: By the Rev. J. SEAGER.

No. 1.

P. 6. (2d ed. 1789) (from Herodot. b. i.) Τέλλω ('Αθηναίω) τοῦτο μὲν, τῆς πόλιος εἰς ἡκούσης, παῖδες ἦσαν καλοὶ τε ἀγαθοὶ, καὶ σφι εἶδε ἅπασι τέκνα ἐκγενόμενα, καὶ πάντα παραμείναντα τοῦτο δὲ, τοῦ βίου εὖ ἤκοντι, ὡς τὰ παρ' ἡμῖν, τελευτὴ τοῦ βίου λαμπροτάτη ἐπεγένετο.

"Construe igitur, et interpretare vernacule, τοῦτο δὲ, in the next place, τελευτὴ λαμπροτάτη τοῦ βίου ἐπεγένετο [ἐκείνω] [αὐτῷ J. S.] ἤκοντι εὖ τοῦ βίου, ὡς τὰ παρ' ἡμῖν, he moreover obtained a most splendid end of his life, and at an advanced age, if one considers the nature of man." Prof. Dalzel.

This consideration of *the nature of man*, i. e. I suppose, of his usual term of life, is understood of course, whenever the age of any individual is mentioned. The relative terms

old and young always imply a reference to this nature of man, and to express it formally is unusual at least, if not absurd. The Professor seems to me to have mistaken the sense of the passage. ἡμῖν, I believe, means not ἀνθρώποις, but Ἀθηναίοις, and βίου not life, but property or fortune. ἤκοντι εὖ τοῦ βίου, ὡς τὰ παρ' ἡμῖν, is being rich for an Athenian. Tellus's riches would have been nothing at Sardis, where such treasures had just before been displayed, but ὡς τὰ παρ' ἡμῖν, in comparison with the average property of Athenians, they were very considerable. In the phrase εὖ ἤκειν, with a genitive, ἤκειν has not always a signification of progression. πολλὰς ἂν σοι δεῖξαιμι, μαρφῆς μὲν εὖ ἤκούσας, (very handsome, having a good share of beauty) τὰ δ' ἄλλα αἰσχυνούσας τὸ κάλλος. Lucian, Imagines, p. 12, ed. Salmur. So, εὖ ἤκειν τοῦ βίου, to be rich; to have a considerable fortune.

P. 9. (from Herodot. i.) Ἀμείβεται ὁ Ἄδρηστος, Ὁ βασιλεῦς, ἄλλως μὲν ἔγωγε ἂν οὐκ ἦία ἐς ἄεθλον τοιόνδε· οὔτε γὰρ συμφορῇ τοιῇδε κεκρημένον εἰκός ἐστι ἐς ὀμῆλικας εὖ πρήσσοντας ἰέναι, οὔτε τὸ βούλεσθαι πάρα· πολλαχῇ τε ἀνίσχον ἐμεαυτόν· νῦν δέ, ἐπεὶ τε σὺ σπεύδεις, καὶ δεῖ τοι χαρίζεσθαι (ὀφείλω γὰρ σε ἀμείβεσθαι χρηστοῖσι) ποιεῖν εἰμὶ ἔτοιμος ταῦτα.

“Ἄλλως μὲν ἔγωγε ἂν οὐκ ἦία—] Angl. For my part I would not go upon any other terms.” Dalz.

Ἄλλως is in other circumstances: in any other case. It is opposed to what follows, νῦν δέ ἐπεὶ—&c. There is no mention whatever of terms.

P. 10. στάς δὲ οὗτος (ὁ Ἄδρηστος) πρὸ τοῦ νεκροῦ, παρεδίδου ἐαυτὸν Κροίσῳ, προτείνων τὰς χεῖρας, ἐπικατασφάζαι μιν κελεύων τῷ νεκρῷ.—Κροῖσος δὲ—λέγει πρὸς αὐτόν, Ἐχω, ὧς ξεῖνε, παρὰ σεῦ πᾶσαν τὴν δίκην, ἐπειδὴ σεαυτοῦ καταδικάζεις θάνατον.

“ἐπειδὴ σεαυτοῦ καταδικάζεις θάνατον] i. e. ἐπειδὴ δικάζεις θάνατον κατὰ σεαυτοῦ. Angl. Since thou denouncest death against thyself.” Dalzel.

Rather; Since thou passest sentence of death upon thyself. Since thou doomest thyself to death. Adrastus had not denounced death against himself.

P. 11. (from Herodot. i.) συνεβούλευεν Ἰπποκράτει, πρῶτα μὲν γυναῖκα τεκνοποιὸν μὴ ἀγεσθαι ἐς τὰ οἰκία.

“γυναῖκα τεκνοποιὸν] uxorem proli gignendæ aptam.” γυναῖκα τεκνοποιὸν is simply, a wife. Concubines were kept for pleasure; wives for child-bearing, καὶ μὴν οὐ τῶν γε ἀφροδισίων ἕνεκα παιδοποιεῖσθαι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ὑπολαμβάνοις. ἐπεὶ τούτου γε τῶν ἀπολυσόντων μεσται μὲν αἱ ὁδοί, μεστὰ δὲ τὰ οἰκήματα. φανεροὶ δ' ἐσμὲν καὶ σκοπούμενοι ἐξ ὁποῖου ἂν γυναικῶν βέλτιστα ἡμῖν τέκ-

να γένοιτο, αἷς συναλθόντες τεκνοποιούμεθα. Xenoph. Mem. ii. 2, 4.

P. 13. (from Herodot. i.)—μηχανῶνται δὲ ἐπὶ τῇ κατόδῳ πρῆγμα εὐηθέστατον, ὡς ἐγὼ εὐρίσκω, μακρῶ. (ἐπεὶ γε ἀπεκρίθη, ἐκ παλαιτέρου, τοῦ βαρβαρικοῦ ἔθνεος τὸ Ἑλληνικόν· ἐὼν καὶ δεξιώτερον, καὶ εὐηθὲς ἡλιθίου ἀπηλλαγμένου μᾶλλον)· εἰ καὶ τότε γε οὗτοι (Pisistratus and Megacles) ἐν Ἀθηναίοισι, τοῖσι πρώτοισι λεγομένοισιν εἶναι Ἑλλήνων σοφίην, μηχανῶνται ταιάδε.

“καὶ—supple πολὺ μᾶλλον οὕτω—εἰ οὗτοί γε ἐν Ἀθηναίοισι τότε λεγομένοισιν εἶναι, κ. τ. λ. Angl. and much more so, if they among the Athenians, a people who were then said to be, &c.—” Dalz.

It is not easy to imagine why Mr. Dalzel should have obscured so plain a sentence as this with such an unintelligible explanation. καὶ follows εἰ both in the arrangement of the text, and in the sense. εἰ καὶ τότε, &c. is not connected, in construction, with any part of the parenthesis, but with those words before it, μηχανῶνται πρῆγμα εὐηθέστατον.—As if Herod. had said, “I may well say εὐηθέστατον, if the most eminent men, among a people most eminent for wisdom, could at that time be prompted by ambition to make use of such an artifice.”

P. 14.—Τούτοις ἀμειψάμενος ὁ Ἀρπαγος, ὡς οἱ παρεδόθη τὸ παιδίον κεκοσμημένον τὴν ἐπὶ θανάτῳ, ἦει χλαίων ἐς τὰ οἰκία.

“τὴν ἐπὶ θανάτῳ] i. e. κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν ἐπὶ θανάτῳ. Angl. According to the fashion on the prospect of death.”—Dalz.

I should think στολὴν or ἐσθῆτα was the word understood, not ὁδόν.

P. 37. (from Thucydides b. i.) λύει τὰς ἐπιστολάς, ἐν αἷς, ὑπονόσας τὶ τοιοῦτον προσεπιστάλθαι, καὶ αὐτὸν εὖρεν ἐγγεγραμμένον κτείνειν.

“Angl. In which having suspected that some such injunction was added, he found, besides other circumstances, himself also expressly marked down to be put to death,—devoted to death. Ubi notandum—inf. act. κτείνειν reddi debere passive”—&c. Dalz. Mr. Dalzel supposes ἐγγεγραμμένον to agree with αὐτόν. I have no doubt it agrees with ἐκεῖνο understood.—εὗρεν ἐγγεγραμμένον ἐκεῖνο, δηλονότι κτείνειν αὐτόν.

P. 68. (from Xenoph. Cyrop.) Ναὶ μὰ Δί', ἔφη ὁ Κύρος· ἴσως γὰρ θάττον ἀπῆλθες ἢ ἐν ὅσῳ χρόνῳ ὁ Ἑρως πέφυκε συσκευάζεσθαι ἄνθρωπον.

“ἴσως γὰρ θάττον ἀπῆλθες, &c.] Angl. Perhaps you ALWAYS go away sooner.” Dalz. The word “always” can have no place here. Araspes is speaking not of his insensibility

to the charms of lovely persons in general, but of his having seen *Panthea* with impunity. The words immediately preceding Cyrus's are these of Araspes, "Εγὼ γ' οὖν, ἔφη, ταύτην ἑωρακώς, καὶ πάννυ μοι καλῆς δοξάσης εἶναι, ὅμως παρὰ σοί εἰμι, καὶ ἱππεύω, καὶ τάλλα τὰ ἐμοὶ προσήκοντα ἀποτελῶ. "Perhaps, answers Cyrus, you left her sooner than," &c.

P. 74.—"Ὅμως δ', οὕτως ἔχουσα πρὸς σε, ὥσπερ σὺ οἶσθα, ἐπομνύω σοι τὴν ἐμὴν καὶ σὴν φιλίαν, ἥ μὴν ἐγὼ, βούλεσθαι ἂν μετὰ σοῦ, ἀνδρὸς ἀγαθοῦ γενομένου, κοινὴ γῆν ἐπίσασθαι μᾶλλον ἢ ζῆν μετ' αἰσχυνομένου αἰσχυνομένην· οὕτως ἐγὼ καὶ σὲ τῶν καλλίστων καὶ ἐμαυτὴν ἡξίωκα. "Angl. Verily I swear to thee, by my friendship and thy own, that I would choose to *enshrine* myself in the earth in common with thee, *if thou wert* a brave and worthy man, rather than live myself dishonored, *along* with thee in dishonor."

To *enshrine* conveys an idea, of which there is no vestige in the original. The words, "*if thou wert*," imply a doubt about the merits of Abradates, whom Panthea regarded with the greatest admiration. "*To live along with* a person," is a mode of expression manifestly improper, and never before used, I suppose, by any man of education.—Perhaps the sentiments expressed in the foregoing words of the angelic Panthea, may be conveyed to an English reader with somewhat less disadvantage, by the following translation :

Nevertheless, great as you know my affection to be, I swear to you by our mutual love, that I would rather, so help me God, descend into one common grave with you, when you had done your duty as a brave man, than live to witness, and to share in, your disgrace and infamy, so ardently do I aspire after all that is great and honorable, as the desert both of you and of myself.

P. 79. (from Xenoph. *Cyrop.* b. viii.) Νῦν δ' ἦν τελευτήσω, (says Cyrus, at the approach of death) καταλείπω μὲν ὑμᾶς, ὡ παῖδες, ζῶντας, οὐσπερ ἔδοσάν μοι οἱ θεοὶ γενέσθαι, καταλείπω δὲ πατρίδα καὶ φίλους εὐδαιμονοῦντας· ὥστε πῶς οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ δικαίως μακαρίζομενος τὸν ἀπὸ χρόνον μνήμης τυγχάνοιμι;

"ὥστε πῶς οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ, &c.]—Angl. *fere ad verbum*; so that, how is it possible that I, thus happy, should not justly obtain an everlasting remembrance?" Dalz.¹

Μακαρίζομαι never signifies *To be happy*; but always *To be accounted happy*; or, *To be renowned for happiness*. The pas-

¹ Professor Dalzel altered this passage in a subsequent edition, by the suggestion of that profound scholar and judicious critic, Mr. TATE. Ed.

sage should be translated ; How then can I fail to be remembered, and justly renowned for my felicity, through all future ages ?

P. 80. (from Xenoph. Cyrop. l. viii.) Τὸ δὲ δυσκαταπρακτοτέρων ἔρᾶν, καὶ τὸ πολλὰ μεριμᾶν, καὶ τὸ μὴ δύνασθαι ἡσυχίαν ἔχειν, κεντριζόμενον ὑπὸ τῆς πρὸς τὰ μὲν ἔργα φιλονεικίας, καὶ τὸ ἐπιβουλεύειν καὶ τὸ ἐπιβουλεύεσθαι, — ταῦτα τῷ βασιλεύοντι ἀνάγκη σοῦ μᾶλλον συμπαρομαρτεῖν.

Ταῦτα τῷ βασιλεύοντι] “These should necessarily accompany the reigning prince rather than thee.” Dalz. Rather,—These MUST necessarily accompany, &c.

P. 137. (from Lysias, contra Eratosth.)—ὥστ’ οὐκ οἷδ’ ὅ, τι δεῖ πολλὰ κατηγορεῖν τοιούτων ἀνδρῶν, οἳ οὐδ’, ὑπὲρ ἐνὸς ἐκάστου τῶν πεπραγμένων δις ἀποθανόντες, δίκην δοῦναι δύναιτ’ ἄν.

“Si bis, inquit, pro singulis eorum factis moriantur, non possunt penas dare.—Dicere debuit *justas pœnas* ; hoc vero videtur esse, δίκην δοῦναι ΑΞΙΑΝ δύναιτ’ ἄν.” Markland. —I think δίκη alone includes the signification of ἀξία. It certainly sometimes means *satisfaction*. “Sciendum est—δίκην ἔχειν—dici eum, cui ab alio *dante pœnas satisfit*. q. d. *Habere satisfactionem, aut ultionem*.” H. Steph. Thes. tom. i. col. 1005. A.

Page 141. Φέρε δὲ καὶ περὶ Θηραμένους ὡς δύνωμαι διὰ βραχυτάτων διδάξω. Δέομαι δ’ ὑμῶν ἀκούσαι ὑπὲρ τ’ ἐμαυτοῦ καὶ τῆς πόλεως. καὶ μηδενὶ τοῦτο παραστῇ, ὡς Ἐρατοσθένους κινδυνεύοντος, Θηραμένους κατηγορῶ. πυνθάνομαι γὰρ ταῦτα ἀπολογήσασθαι αὐτὸν, ὅτι ἐκείνοις φίλος ἦν, καὶ τῶν αὐτῶν ἔργων μετείχε. καίτοι σφόδρ’ ἂν αὐτὸν οἶμαι μετὰ Θεμιστοκλέους πολιτευόμενον, προσποιεῖσθαι πράττειν ὅπως οἰκοδομηθήσεται τὰ τεῖχη. ὅποτε καὶ μετὰ Θηραμένους ὅπως καταιρεθήσεται. οὐ γάρ μοι δοκοῦσιν ἴσων ἄξιοι γεγενῆσθαι.

This passage has misled not only Professor Dalzel, but Markland, and Reiske.—“καίτοι σφόδρ’ ἂν αὐτὸν οἶμαι μετὰ Θεμιστοκλέους πολιτευόμενον, προσποιεῖσθαι πράττειν ὅπως οἰκοδομηθήσεται τὰ τεῖχη.

“And indeed I have a violent suspicion, that he is a person, who, while concerned in the administration with Themistocles, would affect to co-operate in the building of the walls :—ὅποτε καὶ μετὰ Θηραμένους ὅπως καταιρεθήσεται. And while concerned with Theramenes, would affect to join in demolishing them.” Dalz. καίτοι is not *and indeed* ; σφόδρ’ is not to be construed with οἶμαι, but with προσποιεῖσθαι ἄν.—πολιτεύομαι may perhaps in this passage, as elsewhere, mean simply *to live* [Sciendum est vero πολιτεύεσθαι dici etiam—de privatis qui in rep. versantur, et ejus legibus atque institutis vivunt. unde πολιτεύεσθαι ἐν δημοκρατίᾳ Xenophon et

Isocr. πολιτεύεσθαι ἐν ἐλευθερίᾳ καὶ νόμοις ἐξ ἴσου. Demosth. Phil. 4." H. Steph. Thesaur. tom. iii. col. 476. c. "Sed et simpliciter redditur Vivo." Id. ibid. col. d.] ὁπότε here is not *while*, nor καὶ *and*; besides that, καὶ *follows* ὁπότε both in the arrangement and in the sense.

"οὐ γάρ μοι δοκοῦσιν ἴσων ἄξιοι γεγενῆσθαι.] Ante voces οὐ γάρ nonnulla deesse puto: nisi corrupta sit vox γάρ. Markland. Nequaquam corrupta est vox γάρ, sed, per notam ellipsin refertur ad id quod eleganter reticetur, ἀλλὰ μάτην, sed frustra, οὐ γάρ μοι δοκοῦσιν—&c.—" Dalzel.

Neither is γάρ a false reading; nor is there any ellipsis, elegant or inelegant. γάρ refers to the preceding words, σφόδρ' ἂν αὐτὸν οἶμαι——κ. τ. λ.; and introduces a reason for the supposition expressed in them, that Eratosthenes, if he had lived in the time of Themistocles, would have claimed a share in the honor of having built the walls. The reason is,—that Themistocles and Theramenes were by no means equal in desert: if therefore Eratosthenes piqued himself on an association with the inferior, Theramenes, who permitted the demolition of the walls, with much more eagerness would he probably, had he lived in the time of the superior, Themistocles, have pretended a co-operation with him, who had the glory of their edification.—The passage then, from πυνθάνομαι γάρ, may be thus translated:—For I understand that he intends to plead in his defence, that he was a friend of theirs, and joined in the same measures. Doubtless, had he lived in the time of Themistocles, he would have pretended with no little eagerness to have acted with him in building the walls, *since* (or *seeing that*, ὁπότε) he scruples not even to pretend a participation with Theramenes in measures which caused their demolition: for they were far, I suppose, from being equal in desert.—It is not to be supposed that Eratosthenes directly urged any pretensions to a share in the demolition of the walls. The giving him credit sarcastically for an unpopular part of the administration of Theramenes, upon his pleading a *general* participation of his measures, is a mere rhetorical trick.

After this explanation of the passage, I hope my assertion, that Reiske also mistook its meaning, will not appear presumptuous. The following is his note, [p. 425. of his ed. of Lysias] Aut deest aliquid; aut nimis magnos hiatus relinquere amat Lysias in suis ratiociniis, nimisque raras et laxas juncturas: quo multum negotii facessit lectori vincula orationis vestiganti. Deest autem (with οὐ γάρ μοι δοκοῦσιν, &c.) ejusmodi quid hic loci, saltem tacite a legen-

tibus quoque supplendum. οὐκοῦν καὶ τῶν αὐτῶν τῶν Θηραμένων ἐπιχειρῶν ἀπολαυσάτω. mercedem ergo ferto Eratosthenes eandem cum Theramene. Aut οὐκοῦν ὀρθῶς ποῖω τοῦτον ἐκείναι ἀντιτιθεῖς. Ergo recte in eo facio, quod Theramenem Themistocli oppono.—What follows, “ἴσων δέδι pro ἴσον vulgari,” will be approved of, I suppose, by every competent judge of such matters, notwithstanding the disapprobation of the learned Edinburgh Professor.

ON THE FABLES OF ÆSOP AND BABRIAS.

No. II.—[Continued from No. XLIX. p. 29.]

IN addition to the eleven fables, restored in the last No., p. 20—29, to their pristine form of poetry, from the vestiges of Choliambics preserved in the Bodleian Ms., there was given one, first published by De Furia from the Vatican Ms., and restored by Coray to the poetical form, in which it was originally moulded by its author Socrates. I now proceed with similar restitutions of other fables preserved in both or either of these Mss.

Of the ten fables in the Vatican Ms., which I stated my inability to convert into Choliambics, only six are impracticable, viz. No. 347, 353, 357, 372, 380, 381; but in the remaining four, viz. No. 349, 352, 367, 377, some vestiges of what are called political verses are to be found. Now this species of composition, of which it has been said *Μέτρον γ' ἄμετρον οὐδαμῶς μέτρον λέγω*, was not introduced till the very decline of Greek poetry. We have therefore a test to prove that no fable written in such measures can belong to that unknown Babrias, whose versification is of the best and purest age, and such as the severe muse of Athens herself did not disdain to own. A similar observation of metrical niceties detects a modern hand in No. 359, 361, 364, of which the last, however, seems rather to belong to those classed under the head of political verses; while the second may be fairly attributed to that Gabrias, whose fables written in tetrastich senarian Iambics, are ascribed to Ignatius Diaconus or Mastigor.

I ought not to forget to state, that Blomfield in *Mus. Crit.* No. III. p. 412, considers No. 359 suspicious, because written in regular Iambic trimeters, and that he brands No. 370, 371, 372, 373, 375, 376, 377, with the character *pejoris monetae*, although all these, with the exception of No. 372 and 377, are genuine fragments of Babrius, and require only moderate powers to restore them to their original form.

As a specimen of the very low ebb to which Greek poetry arrived by the introduction of the political verse, we quote No. 352, as detected by Coray, p. 264.

Ἰκτίνος Ὀφιν ἄνω πετάσας φέρει
ὁ δ' ἐπιστραφεὶς καὶ δακῶν τοῦτον αὐθις
εὐθὺς ἔκτεινεν. ὁ δ' Ὀφίς ἀνεβρά,
“ ἵνα τί ἄρα οὕτως αὐτὸς ἐμ' ἄνῃς,
ὥστε τοὺς μηδ' ὅλως ἡδικοῦστας
βλάττειν ἐβούλου καὶ θάνατον προσάγειν;
οἷως πέπινύας, ὃ ἐβούλου μοι πράξαι.”

From this specimen it will be seen that the only law of political verses is, that they consist of 12 syllables, no matter whether long or short; of the same kind is No. 364, although it boasts a portion of Babrian form and Choliambic gait.

ὁδοιπορῶν ἄνθρωπος εἰς ἐρημίαν
ἐστῶσαν εὖρε τὴν Ἀλγίθειαν μόνην,
καὶ φασιν αὐτῇ, “ δι' ἣν αἰτίαν, γύναι,
πόλιν ἀφ' εἶσα τὴν ἐρημίαν ναίεις;
ἡ δ' εὐθὺς πρὸς τὰδ' εἶπεν ἡ βαθυγνώμων,
“ ὅτι ποτε παρ' ὀλίγοισιν ἡ ψεῦδος,
νῦν εἰς πάντας βροτοὺς ἐλήλυθε ψεῦδος,
εἰ δ' ἐστὶν εἰπεῖν, καὶ βεβούλησαι κλύειν,
ὁ νῦν πονηρὸς βίος ἐστὶν ἀνθρώπων.”

The same fable exists in the Bodleian, No. 98, but with considerable interpolations and fewer vestiges of any, even political, versification.

Other specimens of the rude attempts of monkish hands to imitate the style and spirit, rhythm and rule of the Choliambic muse of Athens, it is unnecessary to produce. It will be sufficient to mention, as they occur, what fables, in the various collections, belong to that class.

Æsopi Fabulæ e Codice Vaticano excerptæ.

Fab. 347.

Ἀγαθὰ καὶ Κακά.

Contulit Coraius, p. 385. hanc fabulam non metricam cum

alia metrica in Mss. Bodl. et Harl. apud Tyrwhitt, p. 17=170: 55=197: 69=202.

Fab. 348.

Γεωργὸς καὶ Θάλασσα.

Hanc fabulam ipse quondam metris restituere conabar Babriani; sed Coraius eam melius in politicos versus dispescuit, miserendo τῇ ante θαλάσση et ᾧ ante ἀνθραπε.

Fab. 349.

Ἑρμοῦ ἄμαξα καὶ Ἀραβες.

Hic quoque politicos versus detexit Coraius, p. 364.

Fab. 350.=Bodl. Fab. 21.

Ἥλιος γαμῶν καὶ Βάτραχοι.

Ἥλιος ἔδαισε τοὺς γάμους θέρους ὦρα·
ἔχαιρον ἐπὶ τούτοις πάντα τὰ ζῶα,
καὶ μὴν τὸ πλῆθος βατράχων μάλ' ἤλλοντο·
εἰς δ' εἶπεν ὀκλάσας Φρύνος, "Οὐχὶ Παιᾶνος
ταῦτ' ἐστὶν ἡμῖν, φροντίδος δὲ καὶ λύπης·
εἰ γὰρ μόνος νῦν λιβάδα πᾶσαν αὐαίνει,
τί μὴ πάθωμεν τῶν κακῶν, ὅταν γήμας
ὅμοιον αὐτῷ παιδίον τι γενήσῃ."

Hanc fabulam pæne integram dedit Suid. in. Παιᾶν et Λύγας, uti monuit Tyrwhitt, p. 6=163. et 41=196.

V. 1. De formula ἔδαισε γάμους cf. Eurip. Iph. A. 707.

V. 3. Ms. Vatic. ἡγάλλοντο μεγάλως. Inde crui μάλ' ἤλλοντο: quod Ranae facere solent. Mox dedi εἶπεν ὀκλάσας vice εἶπα κλαύσας. Inter se opponuntur ἤλλοντο et ὀκλάσας.

Fab. 351.=Nevelet. Fab. 187.

Φοῖβος καὶ Ζεὺς.

Θεοῖς Ἀπόλλων ἔλεγε μακρὰ τοξεύων,
"Οὐκ ἂν βολὴν τις πλείον' οἶδε τοξεύσαι."
ὁ Ζεὺς δὲ παίζων ἡγείδαινε τῷ Φοίβῳ,
Ἑρμῆς δ' ἔσειεν Ἀρεος ἐν κυνῇ κλήρους·
λαχῶν δὲ Φοῖβος καὶ τὰ τόξα κυκλώσας,
τὸ βέλος ἔπηξεν ἐντὸς Ἑσπέρου κήπου.
ὁ Ζεὺς δὲ διαβάς ταῦτ' ἔμετρον, εἶτ' ἔστη·
"ποῦ γὰρ βάλοιμ' ἂν, φησὶν, οὐκ ἔχω χώραν"
τόξου δὲ νίκην ἔλαβε μηδὲ τοξεύσας.

V. 1. Vatic. βάλλῃ τις πλείον οὐδὲ τοξεύσει. , Coraius, p. 366. βάλοι. Schneider. τοξεύσαι.

V. 5. Vatic. τὸ τόξον ἐκυκλώσας. Emendavit Butmannus apud Schneiderum. Mox idem inseruit εἶτ'. De εἶτα cum pai-

tiçipio vid. Blomf. ad Prom. 902. qui in Mus. Crit. No. III. p. 411. Butmannum bis, Coraium semel tacite sequitur.

Fab. 353.

Κάμηλος.

Hanc Fabulam non metricam edidit et Rochefort in *Notice des Mss. de la Bibliothèque du Roi*. T. II. p. 720.

Fab. 354.

Κάμηλος.

Κάμηλον ἠνάγκαζ' ἀνὴρ τις ὀρχεῖσθαι.
 "ἔμοι γένοιτό, φησι, κὰν ἰδῶ βραίνειν
 μὴ καταγέλαστον, μηδὲ πυρρίχην παίζειιν·
 ἀλλ' εἰμι περιπατοῦσα γ', εἰ τις, ἀσχήμων."

V. 2. 3. Hoc distichon servavit Spid. v. Πυρρίχαις, οπισθε
 εἰσι, et Babriæ tribuit, uti monuit Coraius, p. 440.

Fab. 355.

Γαλῇ συλληρθεῖσα.

Γαλῇν δόλω τις συλλαβὼν τε καὶ δήσας
 ἐπνιγε καὶ βάλλειν ἔμελλ' ἐς ἀγγεῖον·
 τῆς δ' οὖν λεγούσης, "ὡς κακὴν χάριν τίνεις,
 ὣν ὠφέλουν, θηρῶσα μῦς τε καὶ σαύρας,"
 "ἐπιμαρτυρῶ σοί, φησιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάσας
 ἐπνιγες ὄρνεις, πάντα δ' οἶκον ἡρέμους
 χρεῶν, ἀνοίξας ἄγγος, ὥστε τεθνήξει,
 βλάβασα μᾶλλον ἢ μ' ἐπωφελήσασα."

V. 2. Vatic. βαλὼν ὑδάτων συνεχεῖα. Ibi alii latens viderunt
 ἀγγεῖον.

V. 8. Vatic. βλαπτοῦσῃ μᾶλλον ἤπερ ὠφελοῦσα.

Fab. 356. = Bodl. 74.

Λέων Ἀλώπηξ καὶ Ἐλαφος.

Λέων νοσήσας ἐν φάρμακῳ κατέκειτο,
 εἶπεν τε Κερδοῖ, φίλιος ἦν ὁμιλήτης,
 "εἴπερ θέλεις με ζῶντα μικρὸν ἐβρώσθαι,
 τὴν Ἐλαφον ἐν δρύμοισιν ἀδρὸν οἰκοῦσαν,
 φηλῶσα τοῖσι σοῖς λόγοις μελιγλώσσοις,
 * ἄγε εἰς ἐμὰς χεῖρας.
 κούτης γὰρ ἐγκάτων τε καρδίας τ' ὀργῶ."
 Κερδῶ δ' ἀπελθοῦς εὗρεν Ἐλαφον ἐν θάμνοις
 σκιρτῶσαν· ἡ δὲ προσκυνοῦσ', ἔφη, Κέρδω,
 "χαῖρ', Ἐλαφε· σοὶ γὰρ ἄγαθ' ἀπαγγελοῦσ' ἔλθον.
 οἶσθ' ὡς ὁ βασιλεὺς θηρίων γ', ἐμοὶ γείτων,
 νοσεῖ τε, κ'. εἴ τις, ἐγγύς ἐστι τοῦ θνήσκειν,

- βουλεύεται δ' ὅτω γε θηρίων δάω
 τὰ σκήπτρ' ἔφη γάρ, σὺς μὲν ἐστὶν ἀγνώμων,
 ἄρκτος δὲ νώθρα, πάρδαλις δὲ θυμώδης,
 τίγρις δ' ἀλάζων· ἀξιοὶ δυναστείας
 "Ελαφόν τιν', ἢ τό τ' εἶδός ἐστιν ὑψηλῇ,
 καὶ πόλλ' ἔτη ζῇ, καὶ κέρασι φόβον φύει,
 (καίτοι τί πύλλά) βασιλὶς οὖς' ἐκυρώθη·
 ὁ, τι γοῦν τὸ πρῶτον ἦν ἔπος, πάλιν λέξω, 20
 χαῖρ') ἦν πάλιν, σπένδουσά τι μέγ'. ἐμὲ ζητῆς,
 χρῶ' ζῶ γὰρ οὐ μέσος γε πᾶσι σύμβουλος,
 νῦν τ', εἰ κλύεις τῆς γραδὸς, εὖ σε βουλεύω
 ἐλθεῖν, ἵν' ἐξῇν προσμένειν τελευτῶντι."
 τοιαῦτ' Ἀλώπηξ· ἀλλ' ἔκλαρος ἐτυφώθη 25
 τὸν νοῦν λόγοισι, κατέδυσσε ταῦλειον,
 οὐδὲν τὸ μέλλον προσκοποῦσ'. ὁ δ' ὤρμηπεν
 ὁ Λέων μετὰ σπουδῆς· τὰ δ' ὦτα μόνον αὐτῆς
 ὄνυξιν ἐσπάραξεν *ἢ δὲ ταχέως ἔσπευδεν
 *ἐν ταῖς ὕλαις· καὶ ἡ μὲν Ἀλώπηξ τὰς χεῖρας 30
 *ἐκρότησεν, ὅτι εἰς μάτην ἐκοπίασεν·
 *ὁ δὲ Λέων μέγα βρυχώμενος ἐστέναξε.
 λιμὸς γὰρ αὐτοῦ [γαστέρ'] εἶχε, [φρένα] λύπη.
 καὶ τὴν Ἀλώπεχ' ἰκέτευσσε ταῦτ' αὖθις
 *ποιῆσαι, καὶ δόλω πάλιν ταύτην ἀγαγεῖν. 35
 ἢ δ' εἶπεν, ὦ Λέων, χαλεπὸν ἐμοὶ πρᾶσσειν
 τὸ πρᾶγμα τοῦτ' ἦν· ἀλλ' ὅμως ὑπουργήσω·
 καὶ ὅλ' ἴχνη, κύων τις ὥς, ἐμάστευεν
 Ἐλάφου, πανούργιας πλέκουσ' [αἰὲ καινάς].
 ὅτε δ' ἐκολούθη, ποιμένας γ' ἐπήρωτα, 40
 εἶπεν τιν' αἵμαχθεῖσαν ὥτ' Ἐλαφὸν εἶδον·
 οὗτοι δ' ἔδειξαν *ἐν τῇ ὕλῃ
 *εὔρε δ' αὐτὴν καταψυχομένην
 ἔστη δ' ἀναιδῶς· ἡ δὲ μέγα χολωθεῖσα
 φρίξασα κέρασιν εἶπεν, "ὦ κάθαρμ', ἀλλὰ 45
 *οὐκέτι χειρώσῃ με εἰ δὲ καὶ πλησιάσεις μοι
 *οὐ ζήσεις, ἔτι
 ἄλλους ἀλωπέκιζε *τοὺς ἀπείρους
 ἄλλους ποιεῖ βασιλεῖς *καὶ ἐρέθιζε."
 ἢ δ' εἶπεν, "οὕτως ἀποδράς ἦσθα καὶ δείλη, 50
 οὕτως σύ γ' ἡμᾶς τοὺς φίλους ὑποπτεύεις;
 σοῦ γὰρ ὁ Λέων, ὥτὸς λαβόμενος, ἤμλλα
 σοὶ γ' ἐντολὰς δοῦναι τι περὶ δυναστείας·
 σὺ δ' οὐδ' ὑπέστης κνημᾶ χειρὸς ἀφρώστου·
 καὶ νῦν ὑπὲρ σοῦ πλείστον, ἴσθι, θυμοῦται, 55
 καὶ τὸν λύκον θέλει βασίλεια ποιῆται,

οἶμαι, πονηρὸν σοὶ γε βεσπότην· ἀλλὰ,
 ἴθι, μὴ πτοηθῆς, μήτε προβατόνους γίγνου·
 ὁμνυμι γάρ σοι, ναὶ μὰ φύλλα καὶ πηγὰς,
 μῆδεν παθεῖν· ἄγ' οὖν, πάλιν σ' ὀδηγήσω." 60
 τοιαῦτα κωτίλλουσα τὴν Ἀχαιΐνην
 ἔπεισεν ἔλθεῖν οἷς τὸν αὐτὸν εἰς ἄδην.
 ἐπεὶ δὲ πρὸς ταῦλειον ἢ τάλαιν' ᾔθιθεν,
 Λέων μὲν αὐτῆς εἶχε δαῖτα πανθοίνην,
 ἔγκατα λαφύσσων, μυελὸν ὅστέων πίναν, 65
 καὶ σπλάγχνα κάπτων· ἡ δ' ὄρωσ' ὑφείσθηκει
 πεινώσα Κερδῶ, καρδίην δὲ νεβρείην
 μάρπτει πεσοῦσαν, ἀρπάσασα λαθραίως,
 φαγοῦσα ταύτην, τοῦ κόπου μόνον κέρδος.
 Λέων δ' ἐρευνῶν πάντα, καρδίαν ζητεῖ· 70
 ἔφη ὁ 'Αλώπηξ μηκόθεν σταθεῖς, " αὐτῇ
 οὐκ εἶχ' ἀληθῶς καρδίαν· τί δεῖ ζητεῖν;
 ποίαν γὰρ εἶχεν καρδίαν, δοκεῖς, ἥτις
 δις δῶμα καὶ χέρας λέοντος εἰσῆλθεν;"

Ex hac fabula elegantissima Suidas conservavit versus 61, 2, 4, 5, 6. in V. Ἀχαιΐνην, Πανθοίνην et Νέβρος; et Fragmenta fabulæ ejusdem, licet Hexametris scriptæ, in V. Ἄδην, Πολλὸν, Ἡπεδανός, Φήλων; quæ Tyrwittus concinnavit,

Οὐδὲ οἱ οὐδ' αἶθων ἄδε Ἰέρδαλις, εὐνεκα θυμῷ
 Ἑμπλείῃ· τὸ δὲ πολλὸν ἀγήνορα μέμψετο τίγριν.

et ἐγγύθι δ' ἔσται Ἡπεδανοῦ λέοντος,

et Κέρδεσι φηλωθεῖσα θοῇ κέμας,

Composuitque cum vv. 15, 26, et 61.

V. 4. Exstat ἀδρός in Fab. 360.

V. 5. De voce μελιγλώσσοις depravata vid. ad Æsch. Eum. 940.

V. 7. Hesych. Ὀργᾶ ἐπιτεταμένως ἐπιθυμεῖ.

V. 45. Mss. φρίξασα τὴν χαίτην. Atqui jubam cerva non habet.

V. 59. Lepidissimum hoc juramentum mihi in memoriam revocat simile quid apud Plutarch. ii. p. 845. B. μὰ γῆν, μὰ κρήνας, μὰ ποταμούς, μὰ νάματα: unde suppleas versum apud Schol. ad Aristoph. Av. 194. ubi hodie legitur μὰ κρήνας, μὰ γῆν, μὰ ποταμούς. Fuit quoque et juramentum simile μὰ Δήμητρος χλοήν: unde elucet Aristophanis supplementi præstantia, quod exhibet Suid. V. Ναί: ubi versus exstat, ναὶ ναὶ μὰ μήκωνος χλοήν, inserendus in Comici Av. 194. post ἰοῦ, ἰοῦ. Similiter in Thesm. 461. legi debet Ἀγρία γὰρ ἡμᾶς, μὰ τὰ λάχανα, δρᾶ κακός, Ἄτ' ἐν ἀγρίοις τοῖς λαχάνοις αὐτὸς τραφεῖς. Illuc enim respexit Suid.

Λαχάνοις τοῖς λαχανοπώλαις πολλὴν εὐορκίαν ἐπιδεικνύμενοι πρὸς λάχανα ὀμνύουσι, μὰ τὰ λάχανα καὶ μὰ τὰ κακὰ λεγόντες; ubi μὰ τὰ κακὰ exhibet Suid. V. Μὰ τὰ λάχανα. Manifeste propter λαχάνοις in altero versu, in priori vox eadem abesse nequit. Apud Aristophanem vulgatur ἡμᾶς ὦ γυναῖκες. Sed, ut verum fatear, Comici reliquiæ misere depravatæ et interpolatæ sunt.

Fab. 357.—*Λέων Προμηθεὺς καὶ Ἑλέρας.*

Refertur eadem fabula ab Achill. Tat. 11. p. 434. ed. Commel. uti monuit De-Furia.

Fab. 358.—*Λέων καὶ Ἀετός.*

Λέοντι προσπτάς *Ἀετός* ποτ' ἐξήτει
κοινωνὸς εἶναι· *χ'* ὦ *Λέων*, “τί κωλύει;”
πρὸς αὐτὸν εἶπεν, “ἀλλ' ἐνέχυρά γ' οὖν δώσεις,
σὲ μὴ μεθεῖναι τὴν ταχύπτερον πίστιν·
πῶς γὰρ φίλῳ σοι μὴ μένοντι πιστεύσω;”

V. 1. Coraio p. 266. scizontas detegenti debetur ποτ'.

V. 3. Vatic. ἐνέχυρον δώσεις. Butmannus οὖν inseruit.

Fab. 359.—*Λύκος καὶ Λέων.*

Λύκος ἐν ἐρήμοις ἦν πλανώμενος τόποις,
κλίνοντος ἤδη πρὸς δύσιν Φοίβου βολᾶς,
δολιχὴν ἑαυτοῦ τὴν σκίαν ἰδὼν, ἔφη,
“*Λέοντ'* ἐγὼ δέδοικα, ~~τρυλικου~~τος ὦν,
πλήρου τ' ἔχων τὸ μῆκος; οὐ θηρῶν ἀπλῶς
πάντων δυνάστης ἀθρόων γενήσομαι;”
Λύκος δὲ γαυρωθέντα κάργερος *Λέων*
κατήσθι· ὁ δ' ἐβόησε “μετανῶ γε νῦν
οἷσις ἡμῖν πημάτων παραιτία.”

Hic quoque senarios detexerat nonnullos Coraius p. 267. quem sequitur Berger. p. 67.

V. 1. Vatic. *Λύκος* πλανώμενος ἐν ἐρήμοις τόποις: et μοι πρὸς δύσιν ἡλίου. Versum utrumque emendavi.

Fab. 360.—*Λύκος καὶ Ἀλώπηξ.*

Λύκος τις ἀδρὸς ἐν λύκοις ἐγεννήθη·
λέοντα δ' αὐτὸν ἐκάλεσαν· ὁ δ' ἀγνώμων,
τὴν δόξαν οὐκ ἤνεγκε· τῶν δὲ συμφύλων
ἀποστατήσας, τοῖς λέουσιν ὠμίλει·
Κερδῶ δ' ἐπισκώπτουσα, “μὴ φρενωθεῖην,”
ἔφη, “τοσοῦτον, ὡς σὺ νῦν ἐτυφώθης·
σὺ γὰρ, ὅς ἀληθῶς ἐν λύκοις λέων φαίνει,
εἰς τὴν λεόντων σύγκρισιν *λύκος* φαίνει.”

Hanc Fabulam in Choliambico versu disposuit Coraius p. 267. quem sequitur tacite Blomfieldus.

V. 2. Ita Bl. Vatic. ἐκάλει.

Fab. 361.—Λύκος καὶ Κύων.

δεδεμένον ἐν κλοιῷ Κύνα μέγιστον Λύκος
ἤρετο, “τίς ἐξέθρεψεν αὐτόν.” ὁ δὲ γ’ ἔφη,
“ὁ τόνδε δήσας;” ἀλλὰ μὴ πάθοι Λύκος
δεσμὸν· φίλον λιμός γ’ ἐμοῖ, κλοιὸς βαρύ.

Senarii sunt non scazontes.

Fabulæ reliquæ tempore alio subsequeptur.

G. B.

ORIENTAL LITERATURE.

SEVERAL years ago, (I believe in 1810 or 1811,) a work was published at St. Petersburg, intitled “*Projet d’une Académie Asiatique*,” &c. and I have reason to think, that the plan of promoting Oriental Literature has been brought to considerable perfection in Russia by the association of several learned men. It has long been to me a matter of surprise that in England, where Orientalists are perhaps more numerous than in any other country of Europe, no association has hitherto been formed, like that above mentioned, projected, and probably instituted, by the Russians. We can boast, it is true, our East India College at Haileybury, near Hertford; but this excellent establishment, which, in every department, exhibits the most able and competent professors, cannot be reckoned a general or national institution, being designed merely for the instruction of young gentlemen on their entrance into the East India Company’s civil service. Looking over, lately, the fourth volume (for 1817) of the “*Asiatic Journal*,” I was much pleased with a communication from the accomplished orientalist who adopts the signature of *Gulchin*, (pp. 328, 552, &c.) He appears to have resided long in Bengal, and to have been an early member of the Asiatic Society founded at Calcutta, and strongly recommends an association of orientalist in England: “perhaps,” says he, “an extension to Europe of the Asiatic Society, whose inquiries equally embrace the history, the arts, sciences and *literature* of the East, on a more comprehensive and imposing scale, might merit his (our Sovereign’s) royal patronage,” &c. He also recommends as President of the proposed association, him who so ably filled the same high situation in the Asiatic

Society at Calcutta ; than whom “ no person is more capable of adorning the office of President, should the society be extended to London, where he, as well as many of its old surviving members, now reside, and would willingly assist and contribute in such an undertaking.” That some progress was actually made several years ago, towards the founding, in London, of such an association as *Gulchit* proposes, I can myself recollect ; and indeed have at this moment before me sufficient proof, in a printed paper circulated privately, and containing the names of *above forty* gentlemen, who had resolved to hold occasional meetings for the promotion of eastern literature and science in this country—to contribute annually one guinea each—to publish from time to time, a volume of essays, translations, and miscellaneous papers—comprehending *biblical and classical* researches, as far as connected with, or illustrating, *oriental* literature, antiquities, philology, natural history, geography, &c. &c. It appears from this printed paper (which bears the date of 1800) that those gentlemen intended, as a body, to intitle themselves “ *The Oriental Society.*” Among them I find some enumerated who, unfortunately, no longer exist—Sir R. Chambers, Sir G. Staunton, Sir W. Dunkin, Colonel (afterwards Sir G.) Braithwaite Boughton, Colonel Symes, Brown, the celebrated traveller lately murdered in Persia, Eyles Irwin, author of a Journey up the Red Sea, L. Dundas Campbell, R. Johnson, Dr. Henley, Gen. Vallancey and others. But I am happy to say, that many of the original members still live, and are, perhaps, equally willing as in 1800, to promote the cultivation of Oriental Literature ; among these are the Bishop of Durham, Sir Wilham Ouseley, Principal Baird and Dr. Moodie of Edinburgh, Captain (now Colonel) Francklin, Dr. Jonathan Scott, Mr. (now Dr.) Macbride of Oxford, Mr. Maurice, &c. Why the undertaking failed, it would now, perhaps, be difficult to ascertain ; but I have heard that two or three of the gentlemen most active in forwarding the design, relinquished it with disgust, when they found that from motives of personal and private ill-will, it had excited opposition where they expected encouragement and co-operation. Hoping that such unworthy motives would not prevent the accomplishment of *Gulchit's* plan, I am, &c.

May, 1822.

P. Q.

ADVERSARIA LITERARIA

No. XXIX.

EPIGRAMMATÆ, EPITAPHIA, VARIORUM.

No. II.

Bona et Nova.

Edidit Otto libros, in quæ bona multa videbis ;
 Et nova multa libris miscuit Otto suis.
 Laude tamen caruit : vis me tibi dicere, quare ?
 Non bona quæ nova sunt, non nova quæ bona sunt.

De Georgio III, et Caroletta Regina.

“ Qui volet esse pius,” documentum est, “ exeat aula :”
 De nostra oppositum dicere quisque solet.

Ad nuptias ambiturum.

Ergo uxor ducenda ? Prius circumspecte quæ sit ;
 Præcipue vitam moresque adverte parentum.
 Matris enim solet esse patrisque simillima proles ;
 Qualisque est arbor, tales solet edere fructus.

In Mendicum.

Pauper et infelix jacet hic Matho, sub Jove nudo :
 Nemo majori contegitur tumulo.

In Baculum.

Cui natura oculos, aures, animamque negavit,
 Hic tamen est cæco duxque reduxque via.

In Saxonem Grammaticum.

Qui vivens alios æternum vivere fecit,
 SAXO GRAMMATICUS mortuus hic recubat.
 Mortuus extincto sed tantum corpore ; mente
 Qua valuit, magno vivit et ingenio.

In Venerem et Dianam.

Incultam aspiciens sylvis Cytherea Dianam,
 Risit, et, an tendis retia semper ? ait.
 Cui Dea casta, feris cur non ego retia tendam,
 Tendere si potuit vir tuus illa tibi ?

Cæsar natans Commentarios gerit.

Horrida felici rumpit freta pectore Cæsar,
 Libris læva regit, dextra flagellat aquas.
 Dum mare Cæsareæ formidat verbera dextræ,
 Currit inoffenso tuta sinistra libro.
 Dexterâ fit remus, navis tua corpora, Cæsar,
 Vela chlapty's, malus læva, volumen opes.
 Ibitis illasæ metuenda per æquora, merces,
 Naufraga non poterit tanta perire ratis.

In Potatorem.

Vina dabant vitam, mortem mihi vina dedere ;
 Sobrius auroram cernere non potui.
 Ossa merum sitiunt, vino consperge sepulcrum,
 Et calice epoto, care viator, abi.

In Venerem.

Si Venus, ut mendax docuerunt turba, poëta,
 De mediis vere nata putatur aquis ;
 Qui fieri potis est, mediis ut fluctibus orta
 Assiduo nostrum torreat igne jecur ?
 O dolor ! o quid jam miseri speretis amantes ?
 E media vobis nascitur ignis aqua.

Podager Vinosus.

Tentatum podagra senem Vacerram,
 Nec vini tamen abstinentiorem,
 Visens Archigenes : Amice, dixit,
 Cado parcere, si sapi's, memento,
 Fons est ille tuæ unicus podagræ.
 Audivit placide senex monentem,
 Et grates, specie probantis, egit.
 Verum post aliquot dies reversus
 Ad ægrum medicus, scyphos ut illum
 Vertentem reperit meraciores,
 Eho, quid facis ? inquit. At Vacerra :
 Fontem sicco meæ, ut vides, podagræ.

Amor.

Frustra tu quæris, si discere quæris Amorem.
 Naturæ scopus es, non opus artis, Amor.

Longa dies igitur quid contulit !

“ Longa dies igitur quid contulit,” optime, quæris ?
Noctem, ni fallor, contulit illa brevem.

Ad Liviam cæcam.

Redderet ut Phœbum vindex Cyp̄therea minorem,
Surripuit fronti sidera clara tuæ,
Inseruitque polo ; quibus obscuratus Apollo
Descendit vallēs tristis ad Æmathias.
Livia, ne doleas, jussu tibi lumina patris
Reddet, luciferum jam Venus ulta Deum.
Nam si vix unum poterat tolerare perusta
Terna, duos soles qua ratiohe feret ?

D. M.

VIXI. QUEMADMODUM. VOLUI.

QUARE. MORTUUS. SIM. NESCIO.

In Læliam.

Quo possem lepidam mihi conciliare puellam
Tentavi nulla non ratione viam.
Dilexi, scripsi, donavi ; at nullus amore est,
Nec pice, nec pretio conciliatus amor.
At cum spes et amor fugerunt, protinus ecce
Lælia me blandis occupat insidiis.
Et lacrymas oculis, lacrymis et munera jungit,
Carmina muneribus, muneribusque preces.
I modo, et antiquum jactes, ut ameris amato :
Oderis, odit amor ; diligis, alget amor.

In Æmilium.

Æmilius multi e millibus interit unus,
Quem superesse suo fata volunt cineri.
Flent Musæ et Leges. Divis si flere liceret,
Sidera jam lacrymis permaduisse putem.

In Vitam humanam.

Quam bene mortalis mihi pingitur Iride vita :
Utraque pictus honor, utraque imago fugax.

D. M.

JULIA. PRISCA. VIXIT, ANNOS. XXVI.

NIHIL. UNQUAM. PECCAVIT.

NISI. QUOD. MORTUA. EST.

LATIN LETTER BY THE CELEBRATED EARL OF ESSEX.

The following Latin Epistle is from the pen of Lord Essex, the distinguished favorite of Queen Elizabeth. Antonio Perez, to whom the letter is addressed, was a Spaniard of note, then living in England. He had been Secretary of State to Philip the Second; and after suffering imprisonment for a length of time, he escaped to France, and from thence passed over to this country. The letter of Lord Essex is extracted from, "Relaciones de Antonio Perez, Secretario de Estado que fue del Re de España Don Phelippo II. deste Nombre." Paris, 1624. It is headed: 'Mylordus Essexius Antonio Perezio.'

A te rogo, clarissime Antoni, cur tam tristis es? cur melancholia laboras? si laborare possis ea qua tibi nimium places. Si sympathiam sentiebas tristitiæ meæ, una mecum emerge: sin aliquid acciderit, quod te turbet, eloquere: nam me magis affligit incertus metus, quam certus dolor. Non operam meam, non consilium, tibi offerre volo: operam infirmam præstabo, quod viribus non valeo; consilium tu non nisi a te ipso possis mutuari, in quo fons consilii est: sed me offero ut, quod neque adjuvando neque consulendo diminuere possum, partem ejus ferendo levem. Vale animo et corpore, aut utroque æger erit

ESSEXIUS.

CORIOLANUS.

The word *Córiolánus* was, always pronounced as a quadrisyllable, until a late celebrated actor pronounced it *Coriólánus*, in five syllables. It is true that the name of the town is pronounced *Corioli*; but it is well known, that the addition of a syllable in composition frequently alters the position of the accent. But in the present case we must regulate our pronunciation by the metre in Shakspeare. In one line, indeed, of the tragedy of *Coriolanus*—

‘Coriolanus of Corioli,’

the word may be pronounced either *Coriólánus*, or *Córiolánus*; for although it is here evidently a word of five syllables, the first foot may be a trochee or an iamb, by a common license, in iambic poetry. In another line—

‘Caius Marcius Córiolanus. Bear—’

it is likewise of five syllables; but *Cori* may be a trochee as well as *Marcus*; and Shakspeare is by no means strict in avoiding trochees, even in the middle of a verse. There is a line which, were it the only one in which the name occurred, would justify the modern fashionable pronunciation:—

‘Becomes not Rome; nor has Coriolanus—’

But the use of the trochee will settle the metre; and Steevens reads *Romans*, because he says that ‘Coriolanus is accented on the first, and not the second, syllable.’

But to prove beyond the possibility of a doubt the legitimate quantity of the word, the lines in which it occurs shall be here inserted:—

‘In honor follows, Coriolanus—’

‘Welcome to Rome, renowned Coriolanus.’

‘By Caius Marcius Coriolanus, whom—’

‘I shall lack voice: the deeds of Coriolanus—’

‘Let him be call’d for. Call for Coriolanus.’

Here, indeed, Steevens supplies the preposition, in which he is followed by subsequent editors.

• ‘Where, at the senate house? There, Coriolanus.’

• ‘To th’ people. Coriolanus, patience.’

• ‘The consul Coriolanus. He a consul!’

• ‘My surname Coriolanus.’ ‘The painful service—’

• ‘That we have bled together. Coriolanus—’

If these quotations do not satisfy the reader, who is of opinion that Shakspeare is often irregular in his metre, he will be convinced by the authority of another poet, who is always correct and consistent. The *Coriolanus* of Thomson will furnish instances, which shall be here brought together:—

• ‘Of Coriolanus; that alone is left me.’

• ‘The Gods by thee—I see it, Coriolanus.’

• ‘Why, Tullus, this delay? May Coriolanus—’

• ‘Is your demand? O Coriolanus, Rome—’

• ‘Stop, Coriolanus, ere beyond retreat—’

• ‘This answer, Coriolanus, is the dictate—’

• ‘Your pardon, Volset, but this Coriolanus—’

• ‘We thank thee, Coriolanus, but a Roman—’

• This is one of many instances in which Shakspeare introduces a supernumerary syllable at the end of a clause, as well as at the end of a verse. So in the *Tempest*:—

• ‘And he’s composed of harshness. I must remove—’

• ‘Expell’d remorse and nature; who with Sebastian—’

'In which they were prescrib'd by Coriolanus—'
 'That Coriolanus in the Volscean army—'
 'O Coriolanus, when with hostile arms—'
 'Oft hast thou justly triumph'd, Coriolanus.'
 'To boast that Coriolanus was my son—'
 'Since, Coriolanus, thou dost still retain—'
 'Be firm and persevere. Ah! Coriolanus—'
 'What shall I say? Nay, tell me, Coriolanus—'
 'Of broken faith. O swear not, Coriolanus—'
 'Nay, if thou yieldest, yield like Coriolanus.'
 'With safety! Heav'ns! And think'st thou, Coriolanus—'

The actor, to whom allusion has been made, has been reprehended, publicly and privately, for pronouncing *aches* as a dissyllable in the line—

'Fill all thy bones with aches, make thee roar—'

He was perfectly correct in his conception of the metre. The word *ach-es*, like *moon-es*, in Shakspeare, and many other monosyllables in our ancient poets, was pronounced as a dissyllable. His fault was in sounding *ch* as it is in *chaff*, and not as it is in *chorus*. He ought to have said *ak-es*, unless he modernised the verse into—

'Fill all thy bones with aches, and make thee roar—'.

Classical Criticism.

On the day of our arrival at Tekmehdash we met a Persian *chappar*, or courier, who was travelling in the greatest haste to the king from Erivan, with intelligence that the revolt of the Georgians against the Russians was daily increasing. He wore a long linen bandage that was tightly wound about him in many folds, which the Persians say is of great support to the body. This will perhaps explain what Herodotus, i. 72, means by *εὐζώνων ἄνδρῶν*, which Larcher has rendered by "bon marcheur." If it be intended to denote a man on foot, the many bandages with which the Persian *cossids*, or foot-messengers, bind themselves, will also afford a good illustration. They are generally so tightly zoned that they can scarcely stoop, and they also bandage their legs, and tighten their trousers, to be less encumbered in walking.—*Morier's Second Journey through Persia*, &c. p. 209. 4to. London, 1819.

Egyptian Mode of Embalming Bodies.

'In reading the very accurate description given by Herodotus of the Egyptian mode of embalming bodies, I was at first surprised by his observation that "beautiful women and ladies of

quality were not delivered to be *embalmed* till three or four days after their decease ;” although the custom in all other instances was to commence the operation almost immediately afterwards. The reason he assigns is of too extraordinary a nature to be trusted out of his own language. Τοῦτο δὲ ποίεουσιν οὕτω τοῦδε εἵνεκεν, ἵνα μὴ δῖφι οἱ ταριχεύται μίσγωνται τῇσι γυναῖξιν· λαμβάνειν γὰρ τινὰ φασὶ μισγόμενον νεκρῷ προσφάτω γυναικὸς κατεῖπαι δὲ τὸν ὁμότεχον.

INDAGATOR.

OXFORD ENGLISH PRIZE POEM,
for 1822.

PALMYRA.

O’ER the hush’d plain where sullen horror broods,
And darkest frown the Syrian solitudes,
Where morn’s soft steps no balmy fragrance leave,
And parch’d and dewless is the couch of eve,
Thy form, pale City of the waste, appears
Like some faint vision of departed years.
In mazy cluster still, a giant train,
Thy sculptur’d fabrics whiten on the plain ;
Still stretch thy column’d vistas far away
The shadow’d dimness of their long array.

But where the stirring crowd, the voice of strife,
The glow of action, and the thrill of life ?
Hear ! the loud crash of yon huge fragment’s fall,
The pealing answer of each desert hall,
The nightbird shrieking from her secret cell,
And hollow winds the tale of ruin tell.

See fondly ling’ring Mithra’s parting rays
Gild the proud tow’rs once vocal with his praise ;
But the cold altars clasping weeds entwine,
And Moslems worship at the godless shrine.
Yet here slow pausing, Memory loves to pour
Her magic influence o’er this pensive hour ;
And oft as yon recesses deep prolong
The ecstasied sweetness of the Arab’s song,
Recalls that scene when wisdom’s sceptred Child
First broke the stillness of the lonely wild.

“ All these mighty things,” say the Arabs, “ Solyman Ebn Doud [Solomon, son of David] did by the assistance of spirits.” See Wood’s *Account of the Ruins of Palmyra*.

From air, from ocean, from earth's utmost clime
 The summon'd Genii heard the mutter'd rhyme,
 The tasking spell their airy hands obey'd,
 And Tadmor glitter'd in the palmy shade.
 Lo ! to her feet the tide of ages brings
 The wealth of nations, and the pomp of kings,
 And far her warrior-queen from Parthia's plain
 To the dark Æthiôp spreads her ample reign.
 Vain boast ; e'en she, who Immæ's¹ field along
 Wak'd fiercer frenzy in the patriot throng,
 And sternly beauteous, like the meteor's light,
 Shot through the tempest of Emesa's fight—
 While trembling captives round the victor wait,
 Hang on his eye, and catch the word of fate—
 Zenobia's self must quail beneath his nod,
 A kneeling suppliant to the mimic god.

But one there stood amid that abject throng,
 In truth triumphant and in virtue strong ;
 Beam'd on his brow the soul which undismay'd
 Smil'd at the rod, and scorn'd th' uplifted blade.
 O'er thee, Palmyra, darkest seem'd to low'r
 The boding terrors of that fatal hour ;
 Far from thy glades indignant freedom fled,
 And hope too wither'd as Longinus bled.

Wadham Coll.

A. BARBER.

POSTSCRIPT to *Memoir on the Antiquity of the Zodiacs of ESNEH and DENDERA.*

SINCE the Memoir was written, I have been informed that the figure of *Taurus* is wrongly placed in the plate of the oblong zodiac of Dendera, and that the bull should be turned in the same direction as the ram. I have not founded much of my reasoning upon this erroneous representation ; but still I have thought it right to notice it. With respect to the relative proportions of the two beetles, it would perhaps be better to take them as 16 to 14, upon the grounds that the one is larger than the other, without attempting to speak with precision about them, as there are different opinions about the exact relative size of each, and as it is probable that the workmen, who copied the zodiac in the temple from some more ancient monument, may not have paid sufficient attention to the

¹ See Gibbon's *Decline and Fall*, ch. xi.

proportions to enable us to draw any positive conclusion from them. It will be sufficient to remark that the one beetle is larger than the other, and that the proportion of 16 to 14 accords with the date, which other circumstances induce us to give to the zodiac. I think it clear, however, that the difference of proportion cannot be greater than 18 to 12, even if we admit the representation on the plate to be exact; but I am assured that the difference of the proportions is considerably less in the original than in its copy on the plate.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

JUST PUBLISHED.

Stephens' Greek Thesaurus, No. 17.

Select British Divines, No. 16. containing Flavel's *Husbandry Spiritualized*, pr. 2s. 6d.—Continued monthly.

Joannis Stobæi Florilegium. Ad Manuscriptorum fidem emendavit et supplevit Thomas Gaisford, A. M. Græcæ Linguae Professor Regius. Tomi IV. 1822. 8vo. *Large Paper* 10l. *Small paper* 2l. 8s.

Oratores Attici ex Recensione Immanuelis Bekkeri. Tomus I. Antiphon Andocides et Lysias. 1822. 8vo. *Price* 11s. 6d.

Joannis Caravellæ Epirotæ Index Aristophanicus ex Codice Bodleiano olim Askeviano nunc primum editus. 1822. 8vo. *Price* 10s.

Thomæ Tyrwhitti Conjecturæ in Æschylum, Euripidem et Aristophanem. Accedunt Epistolæ Diversorum ad Tyrwhittum. 1822. 8vo. *Large paper* 11s. *Small paper* 5s. 6d.

The Clergyman's Assistant; being a Collection of Statutes, Ordinances and Forms relating to the Rights, Duties, and Liabilities of the Clergy. A new Edition, enlarged and corrected. 1822. 8vo. *Price* 10s.

Homeri Ilias, cum brevi annotatione curante C. G. Heyne: accedunt Scholia minora passim emendata, necnon Heraclidis Allegoriæ Homericæ. 4 vols. 8vo. Oxon. An elegant, useful, and very convenient edition; the notes and scholia being both placed under the text. The "Heraclidis Allegoriæ," placed at the end of the second volume, have received a considerable addition from a Ms. in the Vatican; a transcript of which is among the Bastian papers, from which it is here published. The notes of Schow, Heyne, and the var. lec. of the Vatican Ms., are under the text.

De Philologia sæculi Ptolemæorum, &c. Prolusio, auctore Chr. Dan. Beck. Lips. 1818. 4to.

Epigrammata Græca ex marmoribus collecta, &c. Prolusio, &c. Bonnæ. 1819. 4to.

In Theodosii Alexandrini Tractatum, de Prosodia Commentatio Amedei Peyron. Taurini. 1817. 4to.

Iscrizione Romana illustrata dal Cav. Lodovico Baïlle. Torino. 1820. 4to.

Iscrizione Solcitana illustrata dal Cav. Lodovico Baïlle. Genova. 1820. 4to.

Recherches Historiques et Géographiques sur les Médailles des Nomes ou Préfectures de l'Egypte, par J. F. Tôchon d'Annecy, membre de l'Institut, &c. Paris. Imprimerie Royale. 1822. 4to.

ΑΡΙΣΤΑΙΝΕΤΟΣ. Aristæneti Epistolæ. Ad fidem codicis Vindob. recensuit, Notis Variorum suisque instruxit J. Franc. Boissonade. Lutet. 1822. 8vo. pp. xvi + 760.

Specimen novæ Editionis Lexici Photii ex Apographo Reiskiano, quod in Regia bibliotheca Hauniensi adservatur, cum L. Ancheri suisque adnotationibus edidit Nic. Schow. Haunæ. 1817. 8vo.

Epistola Critica in Euripidis Alcestin; scripsit ad Jan. Ten Brink Joannes Lenting, &c. Zutphanæ. 1821. 8vo.

Fl. Cresconii Corippi Johannidos; sive de bellis Libycis Libri VII. editi ex cod. Mediol. Musci Trivultii, opera P. Mazzuchelli. Mediol. 1820. 4to.

Antiquités Grecques du Bosphore Cimmérien, publiées et expliquées par M. R. Rochette, membre de l'Académie des Inscriptions, &c. Paris. 1822. 8vo.

Mons. Langlès has just published, in Paris, in his Collection portative de Voyages, traduits de différentes langues Orientales et Européennes;—Voyage chez les Mahrattes, par feu M. Tone, Colonel d'un régiment d'Infanterie Mahratte, traduit de l'Anglais, et publié avec les Notes sur l'histoire, le gouvernement, les mœurs, et usages des Mahrattes.

Dr. Remusat, Professor of Chinese in the Royal College of France, has recently published a small, but very complete, Chinese Grammar, intitled *Elémens de la Grammaire Chinoise*. Also La première partie de *Mémoires sur les Relations politiques des Princes Chrétiens, et particulièrement des Rois de France avec les Empereurs Mogols*. This part contains an account of the connexion between the Christian Princes and the

Great Mongol Empire, from its foundation by Tchingis Khan, in 1206, until its division under Kubilai Khan in 1262. The second part will contain the mutual Embassages of the Mongol Kings of Persia and the Kings of France, from Hulagu Khan to the overthrow of the Western Mongol dynasty.

Notice sur quelques objets d'Antiquité découverts en Tauride dans un Tumulus, près du site de l'ancienne Panticapée; par M. de Blaramberg, Conseiller d'état de l'Empereur de Russie. Paris, 1822. 8vo.

Notice sur les médailles de Rhadaméadis, Roi inconnu du Bosphore Cimmérien, découvertes en Tauride en 1820; par M. de Stempkowsky, Colonel au service de Russie, etc. Paris, 1822. 8vo.

Poésies et Traductions en vers de Firmin Didot. Paris, 1822. In this admirably printed volume are to be found, amongst other poems, translations of Idylls of Theocritus, Bion, Virgil, &c.

Disputatio Inauguralis de Vi Musices ad excolendum hominem e sententia Platonis; quam publico examini submittit Com. Anne Den Tex. Traj. ad Rhen. 8vo.

IN THE PRESS.

On the 10th July will be published, *Delphin and Variorum Classics*, Nos. 41 and 42. containing Catullus and Tibullus. Pr. 21s. per No. Large paper double.

Oratores Attici ex Recensione Immanuelis Bekkeri. Tomus II. Isocrates. 1822. 8vo. Price 14s.

Homilies appointed to be read in Churches. A new Edition, with Various Readings. 1822. 8vo. Price 8s.

Professor Julius von Klaproth, of Bonn, is printing, at Paris, a series of Memoirs on the History and Antiquities of Asia. Proof sheets of five of the articles have been received in London. They are, on the value of the Asiatic Historians—Floods and Deluges—The Typhon—The people of Asia classed according to languages—The life of Buddha, after Mongolian accounts—Würdigung der Asiatischen Geschichtschreiber—Fluthen und überschwemmungen—Vom Typhon—Die völker Asiens nach den sprachen geordnet—Leben des Budda nach Mongolischen nachrichten.

The following elegant work is likewise just completed:

Monuments anciens et modernes de l'Hindoustan, décrits sous le double rapport archéologique et pittoresque; précédés d'un Discours sur la religion, la législation et les mœurs des

Hindous, d'une notice géographique, et d'une notice historique de l'Inde, par L. Langlès, Chevalier de l'ordre royal de la Légion d'Honneur, et de St. Waladimir, l'un des conservateurs administrateurs de la Bibliothèque du Roi, Professeur de Persan, Membre de l'Institut royal de France, de la Société Asiatique de Calcutta, des Académies de St. Pétersbourg, de Gœttingue, de Munich, &c. &c. &c. Paris, 1821. deux volumes en fol. ornés de 245 planches gravées en taille-douce et de trois cartes de géographie. Prix 400 frs. papier fin, et 800 frs. grand papier vélin, figures avec la lettre blanche. Londres, chez MM. Treuttell et Würtz.

FRENCH ASIATIC SOCIETY.

The Baron de Sacy is nominated President of the French Asiatic Society, the rules of which were printed in the number of the Asiatic Journal for March (p. 262); and Dr. Abel Remusat is nominated Secretary. The latter gentleman is the author of the very able *Examen critique de l'Edition du Dictionnaire Chinois du Père Basile de Glemona*, publié par M. de Guignes, which is prefixed to M. Klaproth's Supplement to the Chinese French Dictionary.

One of the objects of the French Asiatic Society being to encourage the printing of grammars and dictionaries of the Oriental languages, they intend publishing an elementary Grammar of the Sanskrit language, compiled by Mr. Chezy, Professor of Sanskrit in the Royal College of France.

Antique Monuments of Chaldea and Canaan.—An interesting supplement to Ancient Oriental History; to Books of Travels into the East; and to the Holy Bible, is now preparing for publication, in quarto, by John Landseer, Engraver to the King.

German Translations.—The Germans are not only great original writers, but great translators also. Among the works which have recently appeared in a German dress, are many of the latest and most popular of our books of travels; among these may be enumerated, Dodwell's Classical Tour in Greece, Hughes's interesting work on that country and Sicily, and Kinneir's Travels through Asia Minor. Anastasius has also been translated by Lindau, who has familiarised his countrymen with many of the celebrated Scotch novels. Translations of the following works have also appeared of late in Germany, viz. Luccock on Wool, Busby's History of Music, Greenough on Geology, and Malthus and Say's publications relative to the Depression of Commerce.

Herculaneum MSS.—Sir Humphrey Davy has published the following general observations of the papyri found in Herculaneum.

neum. The Roman MSS. found in the Museum, are in general composed of papyrus of a much thicker texture than the Greek ones, and the Roman characters are usually larger, and the rolls much more voluminous; the characters of the Greek MSS. likewise, with a few exceptions, are more perfect than those of the Latin ones. From the mixture of Greek characters in several fragments of Latin MSS., and from the form of the letters and the state of decomposition in which they are found, it is extremely probable that they were of a very ancient date when buried. I looked in vain amongst the MSS. and on the animal charcoal surrounding them, for vestiges of letters in oxide of iron: and it would seem from these circumstances, as well as from the omission of any mention of such a substance by Pliny, that the Romans, up to his period, never used the *ink of galls and iron* for writing: and it is very probable, that the adoption of this ink, and the use of parchment, took place at the same time. The earliest MSS. probably in existence on parchment, are those *codices rescripti* discovered by Monsignore Mai, in the libraries of Milan and Rome. I have tried several substances for restoring color to the letters in ancient MSS. The triple prussiate of potash, used in the manner recommended by the late Sir Charles Blagden, with the alternation of acid, I have found successful; but by making a weak solution of it with a small quantity of muriatic acid, and by applying them to the letters in their state of mixture with a camel's hair pencil, the results are still better. It is remarkable, that no fragments of Greek, and very few only of Latin poetry, have been found in the whole collection of the MSS. of Herculaneum; and the sentences in the specimens we unrolled, in which Mr. Elmsley was able to find a sufficient number of words to infer their meaning, show that the works of which they are the remains, were of the same kind as those before examined, and belonged to the schools of the Greek epicurean philosophers and sophists. Nearly one thousand columns of different works, a great part unrolled under the superintendence of Mr. Hayter, and at the expense of George IV., have been copied and engraved by the artists employed in the Museum; but from the characters of the persons charged with their publication, there is very little probability of their being, for many years, offered to the world. Should discoveries of MSS. at any future time be made at Herculaneum, it is to be hoped that the papyri will be immediately excluded from the atmosphere, by being put into air-tight cases, filled with carbonic acid after their introduction. There can be no doubt that the specimens now in the Museum were in a much better state when they were first discovered; and the most perfect even, and those the coarsest in their texture, must have been greatly injured

during the sixty-nine years they have been exposed to the atmosphere. The persons who have the care of MSS. found at Herculaneum, state that their original number was 1696, and that 431 have been operated upon or presented to foreign governments, so that 1265 ought to remain; but amongst these, by far the larger proportion are small fragments, or specimens so injured and mutilated that there is not the least chance of recovering any portion of their contents.'

NOTES TO CORRESPONDENTS.

If T. G. will favor us with *original* Latin poetry, we shall gladly receive it.

The Review of the various pamphlets on the Cambridge System of Education by *Philograntus* and *Eubulus* will appear in our next.

The *Oxford Prizes* for this year will also be inserted.

Mr. Jackson's *Itinerary* is received.

J. Williams on Mr. Bellamy's Translation is unavoidably postponed to No. 51.

Plato, Horatius et Alcaeus, in our next.

Observations on *Empedocles*, &c. in No. 51.

G. C. F.'s *Defence of Plagiarism* in No. 51.

Kimchi in our next.

Mr. Wait's article on the *Criticisms of the Pentateuch* came too late for our present No.

The Notices of *Turner's Tour in the Levant*, *Gifford's Persius*, and *Landor's Latin Poems*, are unavoidably postponed.

Dr. Pritchard's *Analysis of the Egyptian Mythology* will appear in 51.

The *Arithmetic of the Holy Scriptures* in our next.

The Collation of the Sept. c. Th. of *Æschylus* will appear in our next.

The Notice of *Gilly's Spirit of the Gospels* is accepted.

Gulchin is unavoidably postponed.

The sheet of *Latin Verses* is received.—Those on the *Coronation* are not sufficiently important for that occasion.

ERRATA IN NO. XLIX.

P. 112. l. 6. *spectant*.—125. l. 35. *Certatum*.

END OF NO. XL.

